FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-242
Tuesday
19 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-242 CONTENTS *19 December 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Defense Spending, Force Strengths Cited *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 1
Inspectors Arrive To Tour California SDI Labs *[TASS]* 1
U.S.Navy Chief Cited on Talks With USSR *[TASS]* 1
Bulgarian General Denies Paper's Charge on Missiles *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Dec]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Chernyshev Views NATO Council Session *[TASS]* 3
'Top Priority' Views People's Congress, U.S. Ties *[Moscow International]* 3
'Roundtable' Discusses Socialist Changes *[Vedenyapin, Andrianov, and Agayants on Moscow Radio]* 5
Petrovskiy, Perez de Cuellar Hold Discussions *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Interview on Malta, Panama Incident Reported *[TASS]* 8
Cheney Using 'Cold War' Rhetoric Over Budget *[Bogachev on TASS]* 8
Bush, Mitterrand Confer on USSR, Europe Events *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 9
Daily Notes Additional U.S. Loan for Poland *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 9
U.S. Commerce Secretary on New Trade Approach *[TASS]* 9

China

PRC, USSR, East Europe To Hold Trade Talks *[Moscow International]* 10
PRC Official Explains Stand on East Europe *[Moscow International]* 10
Commentary on PRC Relations, Malta Conference *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 10
Commentary on U.S. Military Support for Taiwan *[Lubin on Moscow International]* 10
Soviet Military Reductions in Far East Viewed *[Pleshkov on Moscow International]* 11
PRC Backs Private Sector Activity *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 9 Dec]* 11
Sinologist Interviewed on Reforms in PRC *[Moscow International]* 12
Chinese Scholar Views USSR Events 12

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Treaty Talks With Japan 13
  Talks End on 'Sour Note' *[Tokyo KYODO]* 13
  More on Treaty Talks *[TASS]* 14
  Commentary on Talks *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 14
Official on Soviet-Japan Economic Talks *[Moscow International]* 15
Soviet Journalist To Make Space Flight *[Tokyo KYODO]* 16
Japan Firm Buys Mock-Up of Mir, Kvant Craft *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 16
Mongolian 'Informal' Group Proposes Reforms *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Meets With Lao General Secretary *[TASS]* 18
Thai Policies on Cambodian Refugees Viewed *[Trushin on Moscow International]* 18
Impact of Philippine Coup Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 19

Near East & South Asia

- Gorbachev Greets Gulf Cooperation Council *[Moscow TV]* ... 19

East Europe

- 'Mass Riots' in Western Romania Reported *[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]* ... 20
  - Border Situation Remains 'Tense' *[TASS]* ... 20
- Modrow Receives Head of Soviet Troops in GDR *[TASS]* ... 20
- PRAVDA Notes Yakovlev Talks With GDR Leaders *[17 Dec]* ... 20
- Visiting FRG President, GDR Leaders View Ties *[TASS]* ... 21
- Foreign Ministry Official on German Reunification *[Paris LE FIGARO 13 Dec]* ... 22
- Poll Shows GDR Citizens Oppose Reunification *[TASS]* ... 22
- Reportage on SED Extraordinary Congress ... 23
  - SED Must 'Win Back' People's Trust *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* ... 23
  - PRAVDA Summarizes Gysi Report *[18 Dec]* ... 24
- SED Fighting for Renewal, Regaining of Trust *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Dec]* ... 24
- GDR Democratic Awakening Party's Popularity Noted *[TASS]* ... 26
- Planned CSSR Military Cuts Reported *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* ... 26
- Civic Forum Stance on CSSR Elections Described *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* ... 27
- Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Congress Held ... 27
  - New Party Chairman Elected *[TASS]* ... 27
  - Deputy Chairmen Elected *[TASS]* ... 27
- Poland's Walesa Visits Moscow, Honors Sakharov *[Warsaw PAP]* ... 28

West Europe

- Further on Shevardnadze Brussels Visit, EC Talks ... 28
  - 18 Dec Activities *[Moscow TV]* ... 28
  - Shevardnadze, Eyskens Hold Talks *[TASS]* ... 29
  - Shevardnadze Discusses EC Accord *[TASS]* ... 29
  - Deputy Minister Obminskiy on EC Accord *[TASS]* ... 30
  - Further on EC Agreement *[TASS]* ... 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

- Ryzhkov Threatens To Resign If Program Rejected *[TASS]* ... 32
  - Defends Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]* ... 32
- 'Heated Debates' on Economic Reform Draft *[TASS]* ... 33
  - Slyunkov Urges Adoption of Plan *[Moscow Radio]* ... 33
  - Congress Approves Ryzhkov Program *[TASS]* ... 34
  - Report on Vote on Program *[Moscow Radio]* ... 34
- Medvedev Denies Politburo Intention To Resign *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* ... 34
- Further Speeches at 13 Dec Congressional Session ... 35
  - Popov Scores Central Control *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 35
  - Lithuania's Antanavichyus *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 39
  - Alma-Ata's Nazarbayev on Balance of Power *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 41
  - Women's Committee's Dedeneva *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 43
  - Azerbaijan's Mutalibov *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 44
  - Uzbekistan's Mirkasymov *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 46
- Abalkin Defends 'Modest' Economic Reform Plans *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* ... 48
- Members of Congress Editorial Panel Listed *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* ... 48
- Lukyanov, Primakov, Nishanov on Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* ... 50
- Breakdown of Politburo Vote on Privileges Debate *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Dec]* ... 51
- Moscow TV Relays 18 Dec Congressional Session ... 51
  - 1300 GMT ... 51
  - 1319 GMT ... 51
  - 1349 GMT ... 52
  - 1432 GMT ... 53

1544 GMT 53
1614 GMT 54
1710 GMT 55
Roundup of 18 Dec Congress Proceedings *[TASS]* 55
Speeches, Proceedings at 18 Dec Session 56
Nishanov Presents Bills on Deputies *[Moscow TV]* 56
Congress Discusses Bills *[TASS]* 57
Manayenkov on Constitution Changes *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Deputies Debate Amendments *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Debate on Article 95 Detailed *[TASS]* 58

Supreme Soviet

Officials Brief Press on Supreme Soviet Session *[ARGUMENTIY I FAKTY No 49]* 58
Supreme Soviet Session, Amnesty Law Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Nov]* 60
PRAVDA Carries Correction to Lease Legislation *[15 Dec]* 61

Political and Social

Sakharov Funeral, Eulogies Described *[TASS]* 61
Gorbachev, Others Sign Obituary *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 62
Maneuvers To Block Yeltsin Meeting Reported *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 63
Yakovlev Returns From GDR Visit *[TASS]* 63
Lithuanian Party Congress Previewed *[Moscow TV]* 64
Party Congress Opens in Vilnius *[TASS]* 64
Baltrunas Interviewed on Congress *[Moscow TV]* 65
Lithuanian Party, Informals Relations Viewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Dec]* 65
Estonian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session *[TASS]* 67
Ethnic Rights Law Adopted *[Tallinn Radio]* 68
Estonian Russian Deputies Justify Walkout *[MOLODEZH ESTONII 14 Nov]* 68
Latvian KGB Chief on Perestroyka, Security Issues *[TASS]* 69
New President for Latvian Academy of Sciences *[TASS]* 70
Belorussian Front Leader on 'Democratic Solidarity' *[SELSKAYA GAZETA 21 Nov]* 70
Biography of Belorussian Party Secretary Kamay *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 19 Oct]* 71
Moldavian Ministers Released From Posts *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 5 Dec]* 72
Ivashko Nominated for Ukrainian Supreme Soviet *[Kiev Radio]* 72
Human Rights Meeting Held in Kiev 10 Dec *[Kiev International]* 72
Lvov Rally Commemorates National Liberation *[Vilnius Radio]* 72
Council Schedules Jan Lvov-Kiev 'Human Chain' *[Vilnius Radio]* 72
Scientist Assesses Chernobyl Pollution Problem *[TASS]* 73
Food Scarcity Reported in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 73
Explosives Found in Azerbaijan Railway Car *[Baku Radio]* 73
Additional Forces Sent to Armenian Border *[Baku Radio]* 73
Yerevan Reports on Incidents in NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 74
Iranian Railway Passengers Stranded in Baku *[Baku Radio]* 74
People's Deputies Debate on NKAO Viewed *[Baku Radio]* 75
Azerbaijan Ideology Commission Holds Meeting *[Baku Radio]* 75
Georgian Komsomol Plenum Criticized *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 26 Oct]* 76
Georgian Communist Group Independent of CPSU *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 26 Oct]* 76
TASS Notes 18 Dec Kirghiz Earthquake 78
Party 'Zeal' in Suppressing Frunze Critics Described *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 78
Kirghiz MVD Comments on Tokmak, Kara-Balta Riots *[SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA 28 Oct]* .. 79
Niyazov Addresses Turkmen Workers *[Ashkhabad Radio]* 80
Lukyanov Assesses Supreme Soviet Session *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 80
Burlatskiy on Objectives of Deputies' Club *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 84
Gidaspov Address at 7 Dec Leningrad Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Dec]* 84
Leningrad Obkom Discusses Plenum, Meeting *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 85
Moscow First Secretary Prokofyev Interviewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 49]* 86
Further on Ligachev's Visit to Siberia *[Moscow TV]* 87
Jewish Emigration Figures Cited *[Moscow International]* 87
Arkhangelsk Obkom Elects New First Secretary *[Moscow TV]* 87

New Culture Minister Holds Press Conference *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 5 Dec]* 87
Moscow Journalists Set Up 'Independent' Agency *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 89
Kuzbass Miners Form New Workers Union *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Nov]* . 89
Interior Ministry Briefing Held on New Laws *[TASS]* 90
    Emigration, Travel Regulations Explained *[TASS]* 90
Constructive Response to Critics Urged *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 91
USSR MVD Briefing Defends Militia Actions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 93
Hardships of Alternative Military Service Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Dec]* 94
CPSU Greets Military-Political Academy *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 94
Young Philosophers Consider Russia's Role *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* 95
Mayorov on 'Painful Memory' of Stalinism *[Moscow International]* 95
Foreign Ministry Official on Human Rights *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 50]* 96
Perm 'Political Prisoners' Called Spies *[TRUD 9 Dec]* 98
Justice Minister Comments on Court Reform *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 100
Procuracy Says MVD Violates Juvenile Crime Laws *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 46]* 103
MVD Internal Troops Political Chief Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Nov]* 104
Legal Rights of Criminal Suspects Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 105
Supreme Court Plenum on Organized Crime *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 107

Defense Spending, Force Strengths Cited

PM1812151789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

["USSR Defense Ministry Announcement"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] 1. In connection with the adoption of the Law "On the USSR State Budget for 1990" by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Ministry of Defense announces that total defense expenditure in 1990 will total R70,975.8 million, which is R6,318.4 million (8.2%) lower that in 1989. The following sums of money (in million rubles) have been appropriated for the specified items of expenditure.

Items of Expenditure	1990
Purchase of Armaments and Military Hardware	31,036.5
Scientific research, Testing, and Design Work	13,154.0
Upkeep of Army and Navy	19,323.3
Military Construction	3715.8
Servicemens' Pensions	2,440.0
Other Expenses	1,306.2

2. At present, in connection with organizational and manning measures, unilateral cuts, and the implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, substantial changes have occurred in the USSR Armed Forces toward a reduction of their numerical strength and also of the quantity of the basic types of armaments in comparison with figures published earlier. By 1 January 1990 the USSR Armed Forces will total 3,993,000 men.

Data on Quantities of USSR's Strategic Nuclear Weapons	
ICBM Launchers	1,398
of which, ICBM Launchers equipped with MIRVs	760
SLBM Launchers	924
of which, SLBM Launchers equipped with MIRVs	440
Total ICBM and SLBM Launchers	2,322
of which, ICBM and SLBM Launchers equipped with MIRVs	1,200
Heavy Bombers	162
of which, Heavy Bombers equipped for Cruise Missiles	97
Total ICBM and SLBM Launchers and Heavy Bombers	2,484
of which, ICBM and SLBM Lauchers and Heavy Bombers equipped with MIRVs or for Cruise Missiles	1,297
Total Charges on strategic delivery vehicles, approx.	10,000
Data on Quantities of USSR's Basic Types of Conventional Arms	
Combat Aircraft of Air Force Frontal Aviation and Air Defense and Naval Aviation	8,207
Combat Helicopters, including Navy	4,014
Tactical Missile Launchers	1,723
Tanks, including Amphibious Tanks (PT-76)	63,900
Infantry Fighting Vehicles and Armored Personnel Carriers	76,520
Multiple Rocket Launchers, Guns, and Mortars (with a caliber of 100 mm or over) (Footnote: In accordance with the definition under discussion at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments)	66,880
Submarines (excluding submarines equipped with strategic ballistic missiles)	260
of which, nuclear-powered submarines	113
Large Surface Ships (aircraft-carrying ships, cruisers, destroyers, large ASW ships, and assault landing ships with a displacement of 1,200 tonnes or more)	157
of which: aircraft-carrying ships	4
assault landing ships with a displacement of 1,200 tonnes or more	41

Inspectors Arrive To Tour California SDI Labs

LD1712073789 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] San Francisco December 17 TASS—A group of 10 Soviet scientists and experts have come to the south Californian city of San Juan Capistrano to visit the Alpha laser secret military laboratory owned by TRV corporation, where work on the Star Wars programme is conducted.

The visit has been undertaken in compliance with an understanding reached at the September meeting between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming.

Earlier, last summer, a group of American officials visited two laboratories in the Soviet Union.

The Pentagon stated that Soviet specialists would familiarise themselves with modern U.S. laser technology at the Alpha Laser laboratory and will inspect the Alpha chemical laser designed for use against missiles and satellites.

Then, on Monday and Tuesday, they will visit the Los Alamos nuclear laboratory, New Mexico state, where they will inspect studies in beam space weapons.

U.S.Navy Chief Cited on Talks With USSR

LD1712111789 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 17 TASS—Admiral Carlisle Trost, chief of U.S. Naval Staff, told the AP NEWS AGENCY that he is resolutely against talks with the Soviet Union on naval cuts of the two powers.

A weak navy is not in the interests of the United States. The country needs naval forces which it has at present, as an absolute minimum, the admiral stressed.

Even if the Soviet Union completely cuts its naval potential, U.S. needs for naval forces will remain the same, since there are many countries in a friendly way, Trost said.

On the other hand, the agency writes, U.S. Defence Secretary Dick Cheney gave orders to draft a military budget for the next fiscal year starting October 1, 1990 which would be two per cent lower (taking into account inflation) than that of the current fiscal year.

Cheney's orders for 1992-1994 were to axe the military budget by 180 billion dollars. In this connection the U.S. press printed reports that the navy has to cut the number of its ships from 562 to 500, and the numerical strength of the navy and marines—by 40,000.

Admiral Trost refused to comment on these reports.

Bulgarian General Denies Paper's Charge on Missiles

PM1812203389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel General L. Blagoev, commander of the Bulgarian Air and Air Defense Forces, reprinted from NARODNA ARMIYA 12 December under the rubric "There Is No Holding the Disinformationists": "Counting on 'Objectivity'"]

[Text] The U.S. WASHINGTON TIMES recently published an article by B. Gerts [name as transliterated] about the Soviet Union's alleged deployment of its new air defense missiles in Bulgaria. According to the author, who referred to "reliable" Pentagon sources, this missile system, which has been designated the SA-10 in the West, can not only strike aircraft and cruise missiles but also some types of ballistic missile reentry vehicle. Moreover, Gerts claims that two battalions of Soviet servicemen have also allegedly been transferred to Bulgarian territory, along with the nuclear-tipped air defense missiles.

Of course, this report, which contains a definite soupcon of sensationalism, could not fail to attract our attention: After all, it is in effect a question of accusing the Soviet Union of deploying an ABM defense system outside its territory—one equipped with nuclear weapons, moreover. It is easy to guess the reaction that such information—if it can be called that—could provoke in the West.

If we abandon emotion and look at THE WASHINGTON TIMES report in an unbiased manner, we get a quite different picture. There are indeed SA-10 air defense missile systems on Bulgarian territory. But let us elaborate right away: They are not Soviet but of Soviet manufacture. They belong to Bulgaria. Any country—and this is well known not only to THE WASHINGTON TIMES—has the right to perfect its defense potential. Bulgaria has also made use of this right, buying a purely defensive air defense system from the Soviet Union and siting it near Sofia. The new missiles carry no nuclear warheads for the simple reason that the USSR constantly advocates the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and will not sell them abroad. Even to its Warsaw Pact allies. The following question arises in this connection: If the missiles do not belong to the Soviet Union, what can two Soviet battalions be doing on Bulgarian territory?

The attempts to set Bulgaria's procurements of new air defense systems against the Bulgarian Government statement regarding a 12% reduction in the country's military spending seem quite strange against this backdrop. Procurements of nonoffensive arms—this is precisely what the SA-10 air defense missile systems are—attest to the structural changes that are being implemented within the Bulgarian Armed Forces in accordance with the Warsaw Pact states' new defensive doctrine.

You get the impression that THE WASHINGTON TIMES report has a different objective rather than just informing the West's Joe Public about changes in the military sphere in Warsaw Pact states. It is more a question of trying to comment on socialist countries' steps in the disarmament sphere and kindle the negative sentiments that still prevail among certain Americans toward the Soviet Union and its allies by publishing deliberately false information. It is only to be regretted that the U.S. mass media, which constantly advocate objectivity in the coverage of events, are also involved in this ignoble campaign.

Chernyshev Views NATO Council Session

LD1512152189 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS Military Analyst Vladimir Chernyshev:

A NATO Council session was held at foreign ministers level in Brussels. This forum reflected a tendency which is rather important for our continent—the improvement of relations between the two military-political blocs in Europe and growing interaction between them.

I believe two facts deserve particular attention.

Firstly, that NATO representatives now also advocate the creation of a structurally new Europe in keeping with current political realities. The point is to further streamline and deepen the European process as a factor contributing to the elimination of the continent's division and rapprochement of nations with differing social systems. It goes without saying that several elements of this western approach coincide with the East's Common European Home concept.

Secondly, this is the first time that such a high forum has discussed the need to consider new tasks now facing the North Atlantic Alliance. It is very important in this light to strengthen non-military components of European security, to enhance the importance of armed forces reduction agreements, and to use NATO increasingly as an instrument for discussing and implementing East-West agreements.

At their recent meeting in Moscow, the leaders of Warsaw Treaty nations stresed the importance of renewing in contemporary conditions the forms and methods of their Alliance's activities and turning it from a military-political organisation into a mature political union.

This suggests that the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO are embarking upon the same road. This will help melt the remaining cold war ice, increase mutual confidence and exert further efforts to ensure European peace by political means alone.

Although adhering to our ultimate goal—complete liquidation of the alignments in Europe, primarily their military organisations—we believe it is necessary now to reshape the relationship between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. This is why the accent should be shifted from their military functions to political aspects and contacts should be established to promote cooperation in reducing armaments and ensuring security, as well as in economic and other spheres.

Only this will allow the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the North Atlantic Alliance to ensure stability on our continent and throughout the world.

'Top Priority' Views People's Congress, U.S. Ties

LD1612184589 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] How do you do ladies and gentlemen, I am Pavel Kuznetsov presenting "Top Priority," with Sergey Plekhanov and Aleksey (Kuasov), both of Moscow's USA and Canada Studies Institute. Unfortunately on this program we don't have a full minute of silence to devote to Andrey Sakharov, a winner of the Nobel Peace prize, who died Thursday night in his apartment in Moscow at the age of 68, but we all bow our heads in respect for what he has done for the cause of democracy in this country. [passage omitted]

Let's briefly take a look at another major event unfolding currently in the Soviet capital, this is the second session of the Congress of People's Deputies and I would like one of you to comment on the first sessions of the congress, which in my view were quite stormy. I mean of course the debate on Article 6, which proclaims, Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution, which proclaims the Communist Party's leading role in Soviet society. Who would like to begin? Yes, Sergey.

[Plekhanov] I think that the debate on Article 6 has been overshadowed by the next debate on what to do with the country's economy. The government has presented its economic plans for the next few years and the debate is raging on whether that plan is adequate to the situation, whether it can get the country out of the crisis [word indistinct] or not.

But getting back to Article 6, I think that the main division of forces at the congress was between those people who favored immediate elimination of that article from the Constitution and those who thought that in the process of revision of the Constitution as such that article should be dropped, so let's not rush, let's not single out this particular article, especially since the party is the only organization that can hold this country together in this very difficult moment in our history. So a vote was taken and the proponents of immediate elimination of the article lost, so, and then the debate moved [words indistinct] The vote was unexpectedly close. Yes, it's interesting that 80 percent of the delegates are members of the party so there were a lot of party members who supported the immediate abolition of the article. So, but I mean then the debate moved to the next stage, which is the state of the economy, now Aleksey is an economist.

[(Kuasov]) Coming back to the Article 6 I would say, I would put it this way, that I would subscribe to the standpoint of the people whose heart says yes, but mind says no. The economic side of the discussion was very heated and it still is gioing on, but it has to be seen whether the plan which was laid out by our prime minister will be fulfilled, and it was not the case of the quality of the legislation which was put during those years now from the top, but the major issue was whether we could put this legislation to work.

[Kuznetsov] Now, in a few well chosen words could you describe the plan, the economic plan proposed by Prime Minister Ryzhkov? Is it about tighter controls or is it about an acceleration toward a market economy? Because we hear both on television, from the press, from commentators of all sorts, what, or is it a mix of both? Tighter controls first, a strengthening of the administrative command system during the first year of the 13th 5-Year Plan and then more freedom later on?

[Plekhanov] When you listen to the various viewpoints on this economic program you really can get mixed up. I get mixed up because my understanding was that the plan of the government is clearly designed to effect a transition from the bureaucratic overcentralized economy to an economy based on the market principles, on the market mechanism, retaining of course the socialist structures, it will be a socialist market economy. So it is designed to move the country toward greater independence for enterprises, development of a new monetary system and so on and so forth. So it is aimed in the right direction. I think the crux of the debate is whether the instrumentalities in the plan are designed, will give a desired effect. Because in some respects the plan favors tighter management of the economy by the government in order to help the transition. In other respects it, on the contrary, favors greater and speedy movement toward the market mechanism. For instance Gavril Popov, who is one of the proponents of marketization, criticized Ryzhkov for not being decisive enough with things like rationing. I mean that's a very unexpected thing, when a radical favors rationing and the government says no, rationing would bring us back to the time of the centralized economy.

[Kuznetsov] Let me wrap up the first part of the show, I mean the domestic part of the show, by venturing my own point of view, which is that Mikhail Gorbachev's defense of Article 6 may be part of a deal, part of a compromise struck at the plenary meeting recently, the latest plenary meeting of the Central Committee, when our leader had to beat off attempts from the conservatives who questioned the wisdom, the direction of perestroyka, and perhaps knowing his strategy of keeping both leftists and rightists slightly off balance, I think, it's my hunch, that perhaps several months from now some of the conservatives on the Central Committee might be removed. That's my personal opinion and I don't know whether it's correct and whether you agree with me or not.

But let's turn to foreign policy now, and not so much to the Baker doctrine, which deals with the reunification of Germany, ah, within NATO, as part of NATO, not so much to the global events which occurred in Malta, but perhaps to... let's focus on the two leaders—President Bush and President Gorbachev. Would you agree that there is a lot of personal chemistry between them and that perhaps they need each other in this turbulent period of history?

[Plekhanov] Well I think that obviously they have an interaction between them. They struck a deal, if you will, not in formal terms but in terms of making each other's policies (?selfdependent) on the success of the other side's policy.

[Kuznetsov] That's what I mean. It was not a conspiracy between the two superpowers, just interdependence.

[Plekhanov] Normal, normal diplomatic linkup if you will, and that's very good for both countries, that's very good for the world and yes, they do need each other, and I think the meeting at Malta revealed a remarkable degree of consensus. I mean of course there are still a lot of differences, but I mean a remarkable degree of consensus compared to the differences that existed in the early 80's, or even middle 80's. So the countries have moved closer together as a result of this meeting.

[Kuznetsov] What you do think Aleksey?

[(Kuasov)] I think that this personal chemistry, as you put it, is very important because some of the issues that were discussed are very, very sensitive and if you don't reach an agreement in a very delicate way, in a very sophisticated way, you won't get very far from the point we are at now. So this personal chemistry is a kind of a component which is very important for this very sophisticated structure of international relations which evolves right now in our eyes.

[Kuznetsov] So in other words we're talking about personal relationship, about trust, without which, looking into the eye of the man who is sitting opposite you and without trusting him, you cannot reach anything in this world. You cannot rely only on experts, only on scholars, on military advisers. You have to trust the guy who sits across you, so....

[(Kuasov), interrupting] That's very important, that you're....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] You're your own expert.

[(Kuasov)] Yeah, and I think this was what developed between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev. We know...[changes thought] I'm certain, Sergey, that you've heard while in Malta that, being a visionary, Mikhail Gorbachev doesn't have a detailed program of where to go. President Bush wants...[changes thought] when he says that he wants perestroyka to succeed, I think he means that he wants to build his presidency into an edifice to America's values, principles, beliefs, convictions; and perhaps in Mikhail Gorbachev he sees the only man who can ride the tiger, as they say, and who can control the turbulent situation in the Soviet Union and even in trying to prevent this process from being reversed. In this way they really need each other. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] Now, what is the trend—my question is to you, Aleksey—what is the trend now in military policies of many (?countries)? Are we moving to smaller but better-equipped armies, or are we moving to a situation when NATO and the Warsaw Treaty maybe transformed into political organizations rather than being purely military blocks opposing each other (?anew)? what is the trend in your (?opinion)?

[(Kuasov)] Both trends you have pinpointed are very correct. First, all the countries in the world, including the superpowers, are moving towards smaller and more effective armies, which is very sensible from the standpoint of economics and from the standpoint of a real force behind these armies and the real capabilities of these armies. The second trend is more interesting, it's more complicated, which is a gradual transformation and possible transformation of strategic treaties like NATO and Warsaw Treaty into more politically oriented organizations. I would even go as far as to expect maybe even a transformation of Warsaw Treaty, not only into a political organization but into combined political and economic organization. Maybe we should go as far as to combine transformation of Warsaw Treaty and Council for Mutual Economic Assistance together so as to create an umbrella political organization for a.... [changes thought] It will be a breakthrough in this difficult period of Eastern European politics and domestic affairs.

[Kuznetsov] What do you think about—we've briefly mentioned the Baker doctrine concerning Germany and there's been talk about a German confederation. Is this a possibility? How realistic is it? As time is running out on us I would like, after your comments on what I asked of you, a few words about your feelings, post Malta feelings and sentiments.

[Plekhanov] I think on the German question I'm rather alarmed by the trend in American policy to stress this reunification theme, which I think reflects....

[(Kuasov)], interrupting] Under the auspices of....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah, yeah, I think there is a little bit of artificial pushing of the natural processes in Germany for the sake of securing closer ties between Bonn and Washington. There have been reports in the American press that the Bush administration is now considering the West German Government their main partner in Western Europe. Before that it was Britain. Now....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Yeah, but I heard that chancellor Kohl has just backed away a little bit from this concept of reunification....

[(Kuasov), interrupting] Well, prompted by the United States.

[Plekhanov] Right, well, though, of course....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] They're just wavering....

[Plekhanov, interrupting]...delicate, a very delicate game, going back and forth but I think one should be very wary about any attempts to push this process forward.

[Kuznetsov] Now, 30 seconds for each of you to sum up your feelings, your post-malta feelings. It was an outstanding event in my view. That's my comment anyway.

[(Kuasov)] In this period of very turbulent times in international politics and unrest in Eastern Europe, this closeness of the United States and the Soviet Union is a very stabilizing factor.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, Aleksey. Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think we are in a new era.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you gentlemen, for coming to our studio and joining your views on these important things, not only for this country and the United States, but perhaps for the rest of the world. I'm pavel Kuznetsov thanking Sergey Plekhanov and (?Aleksey Kuasov). Goodbye until next week at the same time and on the same wavelength.

'Roundtable' Discusses Socialist Changes

LD1712185389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 17 Dec 89

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by Gennadiy Vedenyapin with All-Union Radio foreign political commentators Boris Andrianov and Nikolay Agayants]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Agayants] I would like to touch on a somewhat different topic, and in my opinion, a very important one. However complex and stormy the processes now taking place in East Europe might be, it is important that they should not upset the stability that exists on the continent, that they should not lead to undesirable excesses not fitting into the framework of the Helsinki process. Because neither the new political thinking nor the common European home idea presupposes the destruction of what we have at the moment. It is not without reason that such a respectable British newspaper like THE GUARDIAN touched on the problem of political situation in the GDR, CSSR, Bulgaria, Poland, and Hungary; it said recently: The power of the people in action is impressive, but it always carries with it the danger that as well as Stalinism, the wild outburst of passions may undermine stability.

[Andrianov] I don't think anyone will question this, Nikolay Ivanovich, because the European home can be erected and stand firmly only on the base of the territorial and political realities that have formed on the continent, this means on the inviolability of the borders delineated as a result of the post-war peace settlement and confirmed in some later agreements.

[Vedenyapin] The two military and political alliances—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—are also present day realities.

[Andrianov] No doubt. But they have not always existed, and no one treats them as the constant factors of the future. We would like them to be abolished, on a mutual basis. It is clear that in its complete form, the common European home will make many present day structures unnecessary. But while the two alliances exist, one must work toward gradual transformation of them into politico-military organizations, by developing mainly the civil lines of their activity while reducing all the military elements. This will have a positive impact both on the relationships within the alliances and on the European process as a whole.

[Vedenyapin] These days the socialist countries have found themselves the focus of the world public's attention. This is not accidental. First of all, such an interest is conditioned by the changes in the Soviet Union. The processes taking place in our country could not but make, and indeed have made, a colossal impact on the life of other socialist states, on our relations with them, on the complex economic and the social and political situation in the community.

[Agayants] You know, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, I'd also like to remind you that as early as at the 19th CPSU party conference it was noted, I quote: In the relations with the socialist states, as a matter of priority, we have embarked jointly with our friends on clearing off the layers of formalism and ostentation, have in practice tied up the principles of equality, independence, and nonintervention with the objective reality, the variety of national forms of socialist society.

[Andrianov] But in order to neutralize and subsequently eliminate the complex problems in the relations between the socialist countries, a long period of laborious and purposeful work is needed. The most important thing—one should particularly emphasize—is to consolidate the internal foundations of socialism, to develop all its political, economic, and social spheres.

[Vedenyapin] In my view, Boris Vasiliyevich, there is one characteristic thing about this. Despite the contradictory nature of the internal changes in Hungary, Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, it is precisely now—however paradoxical this may seem—that more favorable conditions are forming for a further development of the relations within the socialist world, relations based on mutual respect of sovereignty and independence, on full equality, on the inadmissibility of interference into each other's affairs, on taking into account mutual interests, on the recognition of territorial integrity, and so on. Perestroyka in our country, the renewal of socialism in other countries will aid in changing the relations between the peoples of the states within the community by making them genuinely fraternal.

[Agayants] By way of illustration, here are some specific examples from Czechoslovak affairs during the past few days. As has already been reported, a new coalition government has been formed there, including members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the Socialist and People's Democratic Parties, and also non-party members. In his first speech, Prime Minister Mariam Calfa stated that at the present stage his cabinet faces two main tasks. The first task is to prepare for free, universal, and democratic elections and the creation of state bodies that express the will of the people and also to draw up new laws. The second task is connected with carrying through a radical economic reform, leading the republic's economy out of stagnation and providing social guarantees for citizens.

[Vedenyapin] I would recall, incidentally, that on the subject of his government's foreign policy course, Mariam Calfa said that Czechoslovakia is in the center of Europe and will, therefore, try in its policies to further the process of European integration, proceeding from the interests of the people and adhering to the international obligations assumed.

[Andrianov] Of interest in this respect, incidentally, is the press conference held in Prague by new Foreign Minister Dienstbier. Replying to a question from a Western correspondent, he stated that Czechoslovakia is in favor of there being no military blocs at all in Europe, but that this cannot be accomplished by unilateral action—only in the course of the all-European process. Czechoslovakia, therefore, is and will remain a participant of the Warsaw Pact. As for the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, I see no reason to leave that organization, said the minister, but of course CEMA must definitely be restructured.

[Agayants] Responding to a question, the CSSR foreign minister noted that better conditions now exist for developing relations with the Soviet Union. It is clear, he stressed, that when the Soviet side condemned the military intervention in Czechoslovakia's affairs in August 1968; this removed the main obstacle to genuinely good relations between our peoples and the Soviet Union. This is just a detail, of course, but it reflects like a mirror the problems that are common to virtually all the socialist states. What they have in common—and this is obvious—is the crisis being experienced by the Stalinist or neo-Stalinist types of social system, a system of deformed and distorted socialism imposed on those states or else uncritically adopted by them. As academician Bogomolov noted, this system has revealed a total lack of prospects and an inability to address vital tasks in the development of society.

[Andrianov] First and foremost, the crisis takes the form, alas, of the socialist countries lagging behind mankind's general development process, lagging behind in labor productivity, in the quality of the output produced, and in scientific and technical progress. This is to say nothing of their backwardness in the sphere of international exchanges, specialization, and joint production. The slowdown and drop in the pace of economic growth, and consequently the drop in living standards, has become a disturbing fact.

[Vedenyapin] In short, there are many common problems which are forcing us to find radical solutions quickly. In our country, this is known as revolutionary perestroyka, in other countries as renewal, democratization of socialism, and by various other terms, but the essence is the same: Radical reforms are essential. This process has become objectively due everywhere, and as the events of the past few days in Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Bulgaria show, the people are decisively in favor of change.

[Agayants] We are all giving up the utopias, the dogmas, the old stereotypes of which we are sick and tired, and the utterly primitive catchword notions of socialism. We are now returning to common human values that, incidentally, in no way depend on forms of public and social organization, but are inherent in contemporary civilization as a whole. The fact that we are today moving from totalitarianism toward genuine democracy, albeit painfully and not always consistently, means that we are returning to the achievements of common human progress.

[Vedenyapin] The battles for reform now being waged will undoubtedly be of decisive importance for the socialist states. Revolutionary forces that fail to exploit a historic opportunity to renew socialism will find it difficult to make up lost ground later. Those who achieve initial success along this road must not rest on their laurels; it is essential to create a viable system, one that incorporates mechanisms for self-recovery, self-reproduction, and development of an ever more efficient and politically ever more democratic society capable of addressing the problems that accrue, of overcoming the barriers and obstacles that arise, of resolving contradictions; and of successfully responding to the challenges of the future. It's a difficult road, but once again, there is no other way. [passage omitted]

Petrovskiy, Perez de Cuellar Hold Discussions

PM1812182189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] New York—[USSR Deputy Foreign Minister] V.F. Petrovskiy has met with UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar. They discussed questions concerning the full implementation of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan and problems of settling conflict and crisis situations in various regions of the world and enhancing the UN peace-making role.

United States & Canada

Bush Interview on Malta, Panama Incident Reported

LD1812231389 Moscow TASS in English 2340 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 19 TASS—The unofficial summit off Malta was "extremely useful in many relations" and "we are fully determined to push ahead in the field of reducing conventional weapons in Europe, President George Bush told journalists representing Western news agencies and accredited at the White House.

Bush expressed hope that the forthcoming summit in the United States that is scheduled for next summer will make possible the conclusion of a Soviet-American agreement on long-range nuclear missiles. He said both the Soviet Union and the United States wish to complete by that time work on the 50 percent cuts of their strategic nuclear arsenals.

This is why, the American leader stressed, let us move ahead with open eyes and do it. He said he believed Gorbachev wanted to do the same.

Bush pointed out that both he and Gorbachev would seek agreement on a wide range of questions concerning arms control, including chemical weapons as well as the conventional weapons in Europe.

At the same time, Bush made it clear that no substantial cuts in the United States military budget, demanded by the U.S. Congress are to be expected. Practically responding to the call of American legislators to bring the size of military spending into line with the present world realities and take into account major political changes in the Soviet Union and other East European countries, President Bush said that he would not give in to unilateral naive actions and was full of determination to move ahead with a sensible programme of assessments and a sensible program of arms reductions including the conventional forces.

To people who expect massive reductions from the United States, President Bush said "help us achieve such agreements". He said he was conducting a massive reappraisal of intentions as well as threat.

President Bush described the incident with American servicemen in Panama on Saturday as an act of colossal arbitrariness. According to the U.S. version, Panamanian soldiers opened fire at the jeep carrying four unarmed U.S. servicemen not far from the United headquarters of the Panamanian Defence Forces. A U.S. officer was killed. The Panamanian side declared that the U.S. servicemen were armed and the attempt to stop them resulted in a shoot-out.

Responding to questions about possible retaliation, the President declined to exclude the possibility of a military action.

The President rejected as groundless reports that the Columbian narcosyndicates offered 30 million dollars as a prize for his head.

Touching upon his decision to attend on February 15 the summit meeting of the leaders of the United States, Colombia, Bolivia and Peru in Colombia to discuss the coordination of actions to combat drug trafficking, Bush said that the U.S. Secret Service were able enough to ensure his safety.

Cheney Using 'Cold War' Rhetoric Over Budget

LD1812185289 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS - By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev:

The time to discuss a military budget in the U.S. Congress is approaching. And the U.S. secretary of defence, according to a long established tradition, is starting to talk about a "Soviet military threat".

The Mississippi will flow backwards from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes before this tradition changes, maintain seasoned analysts of the Pentagon's activities.

Incumbent Pentagon chief Richard Cheney has had to launch a budget campaign in obviously unfavourable conditions.

The success of Soviet-U.S. Malta summit, the continuing unilateral reduction in Soviet Armed Forces, the withdrawal of part of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe and other steps by the USSR to lower the level of military confrontation have undermined American belief in Pentagon arguments that favour the continuation of the arms race.

U.S. lawmakers have accused the Pentagon of lacking any military strategy commensurate with the changes taking place in the world.

Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, criticised Cheney who, he said, does not take into account the relaxation of tension in Soviet-American relations when elaborating a military budget.

In his first budget-related remarks in Washington, Cheney had to admit a "phenomenal change" in Europe and to confirm data on the reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces, the withdrawal of part of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe and a cut in the Soviet defence budget.

However, Cheney did not venture to upset the standing tradition of drumming up fear of a "Soviet military threat".

The Pentagon chief is already working to receive funds from congress for the development of a new strategic Stealth bombers, the deployment of the MX strategic missiles based on railway flat cars, the production of the

Midgetman mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles and the continuation of the "Star Wars" programme.

It was precisely this, and not the actual situation in the world, that determined Cheney's final "frightening" conclusions.

"The strategic nuclear capability of the Soviet Union is greater today than it was when Mr Gorbachev came to office," Cheney said.

At times Cheney's remarks seemed to be borrowed from his cold-war predecessors.

Cheney's conclusion is that the United States should not reduce its armed forces in 1990 and may only "look down to '92, '93, '94", and consider such prospects only provided there are Pentagon-elaborated terms.

"Now is not the time for us to waver in terms of our determination to defend our interests," Cheney emphasised.

It should be pointed out that quite recently Cheney announced a U.S. intention to reduce its armed forces by 180,000 men.

He also spoke of slashing the country's defence budget in the near future. Now, it seems he is giving up such initiatives. The future will show whether this is so.

The Pentagon is obviously living through a painful process, trying to justify its old military programmes in the changed conditions of the world's military-political situation.

Bush, Mitterrand Confer on USSR, Europe Events

PM1812154189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Meeting Between Bush, Mitterrand"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Dec—U.S. President Bush met President Mitterrand of France on the Caribbean island of Saint Martin Saturday. "Both leaders believed that they should discuss the changes taking place in East Europe and exchange impressions of their conversations with Soviet President Gorbachev and opinions on the development of events in the Soviet Union," White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater noted.

At the meeting on Saint Martin they also discussed questions of West European integration, the concept of the "new Atlanticism" raised recently by Secretary of State Baker, prospects for German reunification, and regional problems, first and foremost the situation in Lebanon and Central America.

At a joint news conference held at the end of the meeting, Bush was asked whether the discussion at the Second Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow had influenced his plans for the development of relations with the Soviet Union. "I have seen nothing which would wreck my hopes for the kind of business relations with the USSR that I talked about with President Gorbachev," the head of the U.S. Administration answered. The French President stated that he has a similar opinion.

Mitterrand advocated a gradual—"harmonious"—approach to the "German problem" and the development of events in East Europe. President Bush noted that his views coincide with Mitterrand's position. But having noted the significant changes taking place in the USSR and other European socialist changes, the head of the White House stated that he personally sees no possibility or necessity of a sharp reduction in the U.S. military budget at present.

During the Saint Martin talks Bush also set out the U.S. position on relations with China. He expressed the hope that these relations will improve.

Daily Notes Additional U.S. Loan for Poland

PM1812191989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "New Loan"]

[Text] The United States is prepared to grant Poland an additional $200 million in the form of an increase on the multilateral "interim loan" which is meant to assist the implementation of economic reforms.

White House deputy press secretary Steve Hart reported this on Wednesday at a meeting with journalists.

According to him, the loan agreement now under discussion is directly linked with the agreement drawn up between Poland and the IMF on ways of implementing economic reform. "U.S. participation in this agreement bears witness to support for the economic reform program being implemented in Poland and aims to guarantee constant economic development," the White House spokesman noted.

The $200 million—an increase on the U.S. "interim loan" totaling $500 million—will give Poland the possibility of fulfilling its international financial obligations, at least until it starts receiving resources from the IMF and the World Bank.

U.S. Commerce Secretary on New Trade Approach

LD1812111189 Moscow TASS in English 1059 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 18 TASS—The radical transformations in the USSR and Eastern Europe have created an investment and political climate favourable to the establishment and development of business contacts with the West, U.S. Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacker said in a Sunday U.S. NBC T.V. interview.

Mosbacher had been asked whether it was time to open the doors for deliveries of "strategic" commodities to socialist countries. He said that the doors should be open to the extent that would not harm United States national security. He said he believed that the doors would be open for deliveries of high technology-based products, especially to East European countries, beginning with Poland and Hungary.

The commerce secretary meanwhile said that the U.S. Government would cautiously approach the liberalisation of trade with the Soviet Union since, he said, it is the only country with enough military might to threaten the United States.

China

PRC, USSR, East Europe To Hold Trade Talks

OW1512143589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 13 Dec 89

[From "Along the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" program]

[Text] It has been learned that China, the Soviet Union, and East European countries will hold trade talks in Harbin next June. During the talks, the delegates will discuss barter trade, commerce, and economic cooperation. In addition to Soviet and East European delegates, trading companies and manufacturing enterprises in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Mongolian People's Republic will send delegates to the meeting. Foreign trade organizations in various parts of China will also send representatives to the talks.

PRC Official Explains Stand on East Europe

OW1912075889 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] China has watched closely changes occurring in Eastern Europe. Events taking place in the countries of this region are their internal affairs. China does not interfere in other countries' domestic affairs.

The above remarks were made by Zhang Husheng, vice chairman of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC] Standing Committee.

He expressed the belief that proceeding from the reality in their own countries, the people of Eastern Europe will find the road for building socialism.

The NPC vice chairman added that China wishes these countries social stability and economic prosperity, and wants to develop relations with them on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Commentary on PRC Relations, Malta Conference

OW1612064089 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Announcer-read Alekseyev commentary: "New Political Thinking in Action"]

[Text] A year ago, or rather, on 4 December 1988, Soviet leader Gorbachev delivered a speech at the United Nations which was highly appraised by people in the world as a declaration of new political thinking and a program for the peaceful future of mankind. In this connection, station observer Alekseyev writes:

Dear listeners, I would like to call your attention to a paragraph of this speech by Gorbachev on solving problems in international relations through political dialogue. Recent events prove the high effectiveness of such an attitude. A major event of 1989—Gorbachev's China visit—indicates the complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. As you know, the road to normalization was not smooth, and it took the wisdom of the two countries, their sense of responsibility, and their efforts to overcome existing problems. The Soviet Union and China did so by conducting a true political dialogue. Moreover, they showed their good intentions and their will to establish harmonious relations during the dialogue.

The development of USSR-U.S. relations is also a case in point. In his speech at the United Nations a year ago, Gorbachev said that he was satisfied with increasing mutual understanding and trust in USSR-U.S relations. At that time, the USSR-U.S. intermediate nuclear forces agreement was already in effect. It was actually the first USSR-U.S. disarmament agreement, and it laid a foundation for the road of further constructive cooperation toward lasting peace.

Several days ago, we saw that the Soviet Union is prepared to continue pursuing this policy. The Gorbachev-Bush working conference in Malta convincingly shows that both the Soviet Union and the United States firmly believe that political dialogue is a means to bring about sound development of bilateral and international relations. This stand will lead to good results. At their joint news conference, Gorbachev and Bush pointed out that a good foundation had been laid for making progress in settling a wide range of issues. For example, the leaders of both countries came to the conclusion that a treaty on reduction of half of the USSR and U.S. strategic weapons could be drafted before this summer. Thus, the Malta conference is another major step in practicing new political thinking and (?taking a new attitude toward) international issues. The two sides did not try to retaliate against each other. They saw their differences, but made unremitting efforts to seek a way to increase their mutual understanding.

As Gorbachev said in his UN speech a year ago, only by taking this attitude will it be possible to remove the barriers keeping people of various countries apart and to ensure peace for this and future generations.

Commentary on U.S. Military Support for Taiwan

OW1712094889 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Lubin commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, 35 years ago, on 2 December 1954, the United States and the Taiwan authorities signed a defense treaty. According to that treaty, the U.S. Government had the right to station troops on Taiwan and its nearby areas. The following is an article by our commentator Lubin on the event:

Dulles, then U.S. Secretary of State, said after signing the treaty: I hope that this treaty will lay bare once and for all the rumor that the United States would turn Taiwan over to the communists on China Mainland.

Since its establishment of diplomatic relations with Beijing on 1 January 1979, Washington has been far from abandoning its old relations of partnership with Taiwan. Of course, the U.S.-Taiwan defense treaty signed on 2 December 1954 is no longer in force, but U.S. political and military support of Taiwan still continues. With the Taiwan Relations Act, Washington is in fact maintaining its relations of alliance with Taipei. The Taiwan Relations Act was adopted soon after the United States established diplomatic relations with China.

The Taiwan Relations Act provides that U.S. forces are prepared to counterattack any force or pressure which threatens the Taiwan people's social and economic system. The United States provides military support to Taiwan in accordance with this Act. The Chinese Government has repeatedly issued official statements requesting Washington to stop arms supply to Taiwan. The question seemed to have been settled in 1982 when China and the United States issued a joint communique stating the U.S. obligation to gradually reduce its military aid to Taiwan. However, the situation in the subsequent several years showed that the communique was nothing but a mere scrap of paper. In fact, the United States has begun to provide Taiwan with modern military technology for mass production of arms in Taiwan. The Americans say that Taiwan is producing arms itself without U.S. participation. The Chinese Government has protested against such action of the U.S. Government, and pointed out that the supply of military technology to Taiwan violates the 1982 joint communique. Nevertheless, Washington ignored China's protest and said that the agreement [as heard] concerns arms only.

At the same time, Taiwan is making an all-out effort to modernize its armed forces and strengthening day by day its cooperation with the United States in arms production. In addition, the United States continues its arms supply to Taiwan. According to available information, U.S. arms supply to Taiwan in recent years was worth $6 billion. The Taiwan issue is casting a shadow on U.S.-Chinese relations, but it seems that the United States does not plan to change its position on this issue.

Soviet Military Reductions in Far East Viewed

OW1712130489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Pleshkov commentary]

[Text] A military airport in the Soviet Far East was turned over to civilian authorities and changed into a commercial airport. On this, our station observer Pleshkov writes:

The transfer of the military airport to civilian use is undoubtedly a very important step to the Soviet Far East, where a comprehensive plan for developing the economy of this vast area has been carried out. The primary task of the plan is to establish the necessary structure in the Far East, and modern transportation, especially air transportation, is a vital component of this structure. Only the construction of new airports in the Soviet Far East can lead to the comprehensive solution to all problems in the economic development of the region. The transfer of the military airport to civilian use will be conducive to solving the task. I believe that this is only a beginning.

In transferring military facilities to civilian use, the shift in the production of military industrial enterprises is very important. This is an immediate result of the Soviet gigantic program to cut back its defense capability. Under this program, the number of troops stationed in the Soviet Far East will be reduced by 120,000 by the end of next year. This is equivalent to 12 Army divisions. Tank units of the remaining motorized troops will be reduced. The number of tanks and artillery units deployed in the Soviet Far East will also be reduced. Moreover, 11 Air Force regiments will be disbanded and 16 military vessels under the Pacific Fleet will be retired. It should be pointed out that three quarters of the Soviet troops temporarily deployed in Mongolia will be pulled out from that country. The Soviet troop withdrawal from Mongolia has already begun. Two tank divisions, 1 air division, and 3 aviation brigades have already returned to the Soviet Union.

In view of this, it should be pointed out that all unilateral measures taken by the Soviet Union are inseparable with the fundamental improvements of Soviet-Chinese relations. This is a concrete Soviet contribution to eliminating the confrontation formed during the years of tension in Soviet-Chinese relations. Recently the Soviet Union and China took a joint action to reduce armed forces—they concluded the first round of talks between Soviet and Chinese diplomatic and military experts on the reduction of armed forces and the consolidation of military trust in border areas.

PRC Backs Private Sector Activity

90UI0199A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[TASS report: "RENMIN RIBAO on the Private Sector"]

[Text] Beijing, 8 December—"Some people have been saying recently that the state intends to limit the development of the private economy. The policy proclaimed several years ago on the development of this sector has allegedly proven to be a mistake, its implementation has led to chaos on the market, and the Central Committee is speaking of the need for a purge. Others are maintaining that the private businessman is hanging on only thanks to avoidance of the payment of taxes, getting rich by profiteering. All this talk is ultimately leading to some private businessmen thinking about closing down. Those who had previously intended testing themselves in the field of enterprise are also worried...."

This letter was sent to the editors of the party paper RENMIN RIBAO by Zhang Chungshen, representative of the local authorities of a community of Hebei Province, requesting "an explanation of the true state of affairs and reassurances."

Worries are superfluous, RENMIN RIBAO responded to Zhang Chungshen's letter. The political guideline of the 13th CPC [Communist Party of China] Congress encouraging the existence and development of individual and private enterprises within the framework permitted by the state remains unchanged. This sector of the national economy is playing a significant part in the development of society's productive forces and an increase in the number of jobs, which has been proven by the decade of practice of the reforms. The opinions circulating in a number of places concerning some changes in this field are groundless and mistaken. The private economy is justifiably a supplement to the social national economy, the CPC Central Committee organ writes.

Sinologist Interviewed on Reforms in PRC

OW1812002489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 8 Dec 89

["Excerpts" of interview with Professor Miyasenikov, noted sinologist, historian, and deputy director of the (Soviet Far East Institute) by station reporter Balisavalamov; date and place not given]

[Text] Professor Miyasenikov said: Although China has thus far achieved great success in reform, problems are inevitable in instituting changes in such a big country. Developments in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries show that nations which want to advance socialism inevitably make errors and encounter problems in consolidating, developing, and transforming socialism. China's economic problems began to intensify toward the end of last year and early this year, causing inflation to soar. Social and political troubles compounded the economic problems. Authorities were forced to take measures to stabilize the domestic situation and consolidate the economy as a way of ensuring continuing development.

Miyasenikov said: Like military offensives, China's current reforms need to pause now and then, in order to consolidate the rear forces, reevaluate troop strength, and redeploy the troops before marching on. Preparations are needed to forge ahead with the reforms. Just how long such preparations will take is hard to tell. It may probably be 2 to 3 years before China renews its reform drive.

I believe China's reforms will not cease; they cannot be reversed. China will continue to develop. The Chinese people have set certain goals for themselves, aiming to quadruple the industrial and agricultural output of 1980 in the year 2000, and to elevate their economy to moderate world levels by the middle of the next century. The only way to accomplish these goals is through reform. It is important to note that economic and political reforms are inseparable. Political (?change) can lead to gradual accomplishment of other objectives. In this respect, only the Chinese people can decide what measures to take in political reform, and when to initiate such reform, in order to solidify economic renewal through political transformation. Only the Chinese people can determine what economic actions to take to prepare for political reform.

Professor Miyasenikov concluded: These problems are China's internal affairs. We wish the Chinese people success in their endeavors.

Chinese Scholar Views USSR Events

OW1412012789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 29 Nov 89

[Interview by station reporter Maginko with Li Jinze, deputy director of the Institute of Soviet and Eastern Europe Affairs under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; date and place of interview not given—recorded]

[Text] [Li Jinze] I think that Soviet leaders and people are both working hard to carry out reform in the Soviet Union and to maintain a positive attitude toward the reform. My initial impression is that the leaders and the common people in the Soviet Union are convinced that there will be no way out for socialist countries if they do not carry out reform. The Soviet state leaders and the leaders of the CPSU headed by Comrade Gorbachev have great determination to carry out the reform. They have made great strikes in carrying out the reform. In the reform of the political structure, in realizing socialist democracy, and in promoting openess, they have taken major and bold measures. These measures provide great motivation for promoting the democratization of Soviet society. They have received support from the overwhelming majority of the Soviet people.

Of course, reform is a very complicated process. Reform is a revolution, as Comrade Gorbachev has said. Since it is a revolution, it will naturally encounter many complicated problems or even stir up some problems, including socialist turmoil, in certain localities. In my opinion, it is impossible to totally avoid those problems in the course of reform. A leader who can understand the people's wishes can reduce the temporary difficulties to the minimum. Of course, the Soviet Union has encountered some problems in carrying out its reform. For example, the current economic reform and the supply of commodities in the market have not achieved significant results. I know that, based on my contacts with the people, the masses have many complaints in this respect. The Soviet leaders are also quite clear about this situation. They are taking positive measures to change this situation.

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Treaty Talks With Japan

Talks End on 'Sour Note'

OW1812154989 Tokyo KYODO in English 1505 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 18 KYODO—Japan-Soviet talks on a peace treaty ended on a sour note Monday as Soviet negotiators called on their Japanese counterparts to heed the results of World War II regarding Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido, Foreign Ministry officials said.

Officials quoted Soviet negotiators as saying the most effective way to move peace treaty talks forward would be for Japan to recognize current realities based on the outcome of World War II and to "halt groundless criticisms" over the territorial status quo.

"There was absolutely nothing like a fresh convergence of views," said an official on the six-and-a-half hours of negotiations at the Foreign Ministry's Iikura Guest House.

The outcome was a disappointment to diplomatic observers who had expected to see progress on the territorial dispute over four northern islands in advance of the Soviet foreign minister's visit to Japan in March.

The trip by Eduard Shevardnadze is expected to set the stage for a historic visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991.

Expectations had been heightened by Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev's suggestive mention in Tokyo recently of a "third approach" to achieving improved bilateral relations through dialogue, particularly in the working-level groups.

At Monday's meeting, Vice Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, leader of the Soviet delegation, hailed the working groups as a key element in a wide program of bilateral political contacts that is to precede Gorbachev's visit here.

Rogachev told his Japanese counterpart Hisashi Owada, deputy foreign minister, that no matter how complicated and sensitive the territorial issue may be, the two sides must come up with solutions.

He added, however, that they must be based on "a realistic foundation."

Japan has set the return of the islands—Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and the Habomai group—as a precondition for the completion of a peace treaty and full economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Officials said the negotiators, meeting for the fourth time since the working-level groups were set up last December, spent most of the time debating the historical and legal merits of their respective claims to the disputed islands.

They also discussed the content of a proposed peace treaty, with the Soviets saying it should be a lasting document incorporating guiding principles for the bilateral relationship and resolving issues arising out of World War II.

The Soviets reiterated their understanding that the treaty should not undermine the U.S.-Japan security treaty, a pledge made earlier in the year when then Foreign Minister Sosuke Uno visited Moscow, officials said.

Officials said the primary area of dispute in the territorial negotiations was over the status of the islands at the conclusion of the World War II.

Japanese officials said the meeting was almost entirely given over to the Soviet presentation of their views, as Japan had its turn at the previous meeting in Moscow last April.

The Soviets refuted Japanese claims that the islands were not included in the Kuriles chain, which was ceded to Soviet control in February 1945 at the Yalta Conference in return for the Soviet entry into the war against Japan.

They pointed out that Japan agreed to accept any condition imposed upon it by the Allied forces when it acceded to the surrender ultimatum issued at the Potsdam Conference in August 1945.

Japan's argument that the agreement made at Yalta is not binding since Japan was unaware of its existence at the time, therefore does not hold water, the Soviets said.

In addition, the Soviets said, Japan never issued a clear objection to the Yalta agreement when it was made public after the war's end. Its territorial claims were only made years later.

In any case, Japan knowingly renounced its sovereignty over the Kuriles when it signed the San Francisco peace treaty, the Soviets said.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union was not a signatory, the treaty should be internationally recognized, they said.

Officials said that while Japan issued a rebuttal, Japan's detailed response to the Soviet arguments will come at the fifth working-level meeting, which the two sides agreed should be held before Shevardnadze's visit to Japan in March.

Rogachev will meet Owada again on Tuesday for more talks outside the frmawork of the working group negotiations, but this time the agenda will be completely open.

He is also expected to pay a courtesy call on Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, who will arrive in Tokyo earlier Tuesday from an unscheduled stopover in Moscow.

More on Treaty Talks

LD1812212489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, 18 Dec (TASS)—A 2-day session of the permanent working group on the peace treaty between the USSR and Japan opened in Tokyo today. The Soviet delegation is headed by Igor Rogachev, deputy USSR foreign minister, and the Japanese by Hisashi Owada, deputy foreign minister.

The accord to form a working group on the peace treaty was reached in December 1988 during Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Japan.

In the course of today's session the Soviet delegation presented its position regarding the general concept of the peace treaty. It was stressed that a peace treaty is a fundamental and comprehensive document which has to take into account those changes that occurred in the world both after the end of World War II and after the 1956 Soviet-Japanese declaration was signed. This document should reflect not only the present state of relations between the USSR and Japan, but should also give scope for their development. Therefore, it is desirable that it should enshrine fundamental provisions which would create the basis for a progressive development of Soviet- Japanese relations in various spheres.

The geographical questions of the peace treaty have received considerable attention during the session. The Soviet side has given a detailed account of its position on the so-called territorial question. In particular, new arguments were put forward, confirming that Japan is bound by the Yalta agreement as well as by a number of other documents of the war and postwar period, determining, in essence, the present territorial boundaries between both countries. Additional historical information was set out, testifying that Russia was first to discover and develop the Kurile Islands, their southern part included.

Having expressed agreement with the Japanese viewpoint that it is desirable to carry out the work of the group on the peace treaty in a more constructive framework, the Soviet side expressed the view that it would be facilitated if the Japanese side went over to a position of recognizing the existing realities that took shape following World War II. A more in-depth discussion of all questions which may form the content of the treaty would also facilitate a more constructive dialogue at the session of the working group. This would make it possible to broaden the sphere of agreement and to narrow down the area of differences. The overall development of bilateral relations along various directions could also give additional momentum to the work on the elaboration of the peace treaty.

Commentary on Talks

OW1912081589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Dmitriyev Commentary]

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen: The regular meeting of the Soviet-Japanese deputy ministerial level working group on peace treaty starts in Tokyo today. In this connection, Moscow Radio commentator Dmitriyev wrote the following comments:

One year has passed since the working group was formed. With the present meeting, three rounds of meetings within this framework will have already been held. In the past talks, both sides have been able to understand better the other party's position on the major political issues obstructing the signing of a peace treaty. Both sides insisted on their own views on the peace treaty. However, the Soviet Union believes that as the starting point in the approach to the contents of the treaty, the conventions in postwar international relations should be taken into consideration. The peace treaty should broadly embody both countries' allegiance to the basic principles and purposes of the UN Charter and other documents, clearly state both countries' peaceful thinking and intention to act in the spirit of cooperation and noninterference in the other's internal affairs in bilateral relations, and declare their intention to forego all acts threatening the other party's security. As can be seen from the above, the Soviet Union considers the peace treaty a comprehensive basic document on bilateral relations.

In the past year, both the USSR and Japan have indicated their recognition of the importance of the peace treaty. Needless to say, this has created a spirit of cooperation on both sides. On the other hand, the consistent differences in the views of both countries seem to rule out any sudden progress. Although we do understand this, we would like to note the steady improvement in Soviet relations with the other major Western nations, led by the United States. In this sense, Soviet-Japanese relations have been left far behind. As long as there is the absence of a peace treaty, this gap will become even more evident. We must say that the absence of a peace treaty at present, 45 years after the end of World War II, is absolutely anachronistic. For this reason, the state of Soviet-Japanese relations, which ignores both countries' possibilities and their positions and roles in the world, also has the danger of becoming anachronistic in the near future.

This feeling becomes more acute when considered in the light of the summit meeting of Soviet and U.S. leaders in Malta. As a result of the summit, East-West dialogue has become a worldwide trend. This signifies a major change from the cold war in the past. Therefore, we must say that it would be unnatural for Soviet-Japanese relations to continue to be excluded from such a trend and for them not to take advantage of the wide open possibilities. What the two neighboring countries, the Soviet

Union and Japan, need most right now is a dialogue toward cooperation and to abandon the environment based on the cold war. There are numerous evidences indicating that Japan understands this. For instance, during his meeting with former U.S. Secretary of State Schultz, Prime Minister Kaifu stated his view that the U.S.-Soviet Malta Summit created realistic possibilities for improving Japan-Soviet relations. Before him, Foreign Minister Nakayama had also given a similar comment.

Recently, a Supreme Soviet delegation led by CPSU Politburo member Yakovlev visited Japan. The visit gave expression to both sides' desire to deepen mutual understanding. Politburo member Yakovlev advocated a comprehensive development of Soviet-Japanese relations. He said that with this, problems which seem complicated today will become much more easier. According to Japanese newspapers, Japanese representatives saw some similarities in the third way in conducting bilateral relations advocated by Politburo member Yakovlev and Japan's idea of a well-balanced development of relations. This, and the announcement of the date of Chairman Gorbachev's visit to Japan have created a favorable environment for the meeting of the working group on the peace treaty starting today. We hope that the working group will conduct its activities in the spirit of mutual understanding in accordance with the international trend of dialogues.

On the eve of the visit to Japan of the Supreme Soviet delegation led by Politburo member Yakovlev, ASAHI SHIMBUN expressed its view that Japan-Soviet diplomacy has stopped giving the impression of a tug-of-war when it tackles certain issues. The present working group meeting will probably indicate how correct such an optimistic view is.

Official on Soviet-Japan Economic Talks

OW1812063089 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Soviet-Japanese government-level trade and economic talks were held in Tokyo recently. A Moscow Radio reporter interviewed Yuriy Ledentsov, chief of the Main Administration for Economic Relations with Advanced Capitalist Countries of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, on the meeting. We will now broadcast a summary of that interview. The following are Ledentsov's remarks:

The Soviet-Japanese government-level trade and economic talks are held in Moscow and Tokyo alternately once a year. The fourth round of the talks was held this year. The head of the Soviet delegation was Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Korolev, and the Japanese delegation was led by Deputy Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs Watanabe. The purpose of the meeting was to review Soviet-Japanese trade and economic relations in the past year and exchange views on the present situation and future prospects.

With regard to achievements in the past year, it was first pointed out that the declining trend in overall volume of Soviet-Japanese trade up to 1988 had been checked. The trade volume for 1988 was 3.2 billion rubles, and it was a gratifying fact that Soviet exports to Japan reached 100 million rubles.

Looking at the trade balance, although the USSR used to suffer a huge deficit, the balance is improving somewhat in Soviet favor. Soviet exports, as before, consisted mainly of coal, timber, and petroleum products, while machinery, equipment, and related items occupied a significant share of Soviet purchases from the Japanese side. The second positive factor cited during the talks was the possibility that trade volume in fiscal 1989 may surpass that of 1988.

Furthermore, the keen interest of both sides in bilateral coastal trade and the consequent growth in coastal trade volume were noted in particular. Coastal trade turnover made up a large and stable part of the overall trade volume.

Japanese companies are looking for possible import commodities and partners in the Soviet Far East. They want to open up offices in Khabarovsk, Nakhodka, and other Far Eastern regions. On our part, we welcome such enthusiasm and try to accomodate such desires of the Japanese partners as much as possible.

Better and new methods of bilateral trade were also discussed during the government-level talks. Japanese participants from business circles all agreed that the old viewpoint of relying on state-to-state agreements is not sufficient to give full play to the possibilities both countries offer. Direct exchanges between cooperatives, joint ventures, and enterprises, the purchase of knowhow, the purchase of patents and technical tieups were added to the existing methods to enliven economic exchanges between the two countries. Certain accomplishments have already been achieved in these new modes of exchange. At present, 22 joint ventures have been established with Japan; among them 6 to 8 enterprises are already turning out products. Some of them are joint ventures [words indistinct] which are doing very well. During the talks, it was pointed out that while Soviet-Japanese joint ventures are doing well, there are only 22 of them. The Soviet side stressed to the Japanese side that there are a total of more than 1,000 joint ventures with foreign countries in the USSR and pointed out that it would not be wise for Japan to be left behind in this trend.

Subsequently, the Soviet side proposed the signing of a series of legal documents in order to promote bilateral relations in the future. First, there was the proposal on the establishment of joint ventures. The Soviet side proposed the signing of a basic agreement, or at least to begin preparations for the signing of such agreement. Second, it was proposed that joint ventures be established not only in the USSR but also in Japan. Furthermore, the introduction of industrial cooperation plans, following the examples of other western countries [words indistinct], and the opening of representative offices of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, and other organs to conduct activities in Japan were also proposed.

These proposals were presented because there was a need to protect the capital investments of joint venture partners by legal means. Already numerous agreements on basic investments had been signed with Dutch, British, West German, and other Western partners upon their own initiative. During General Secretary Gorbachev's recent visit to Italy, a similar agreement was also signed. Long-term economic and industrial cooperation plans had been signed with most advanced western countries. During the Soviet-Japanese talks, the Soviet side explained these plans in detail to the Japanese delegation.

On the other hand, the Japanese side raised the question of scarcity of information provided by the Soviet side to its foreign partners. Of course, we explained to the Japanese side the present state of Soviet foreign economic relations, and added that with the opening of representative offices of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry and Bank for Foreign Economic Activity in Japan, detailed information on the Soviet market and other foreign partners of the USSR would be available in Japan. However, the Japanese side did not show its understanding of this proposal. The Japanese side linked this issue to that well-known political issue and refused to compromise.

As to issues on which agreement had been reached between the USSR and Japan, preparations would be made to sign a new agreement on trade and terms of payment from 1991 to 1995, and the agreement would be signed in 1990, by the time the current 5-year agreement expires. Agreement was also reached on drafting an agreement on coastal trade in 1990. The next round of the talks will be held in Moscow in 1999. [as heard; should presumably read 1990]

Soviet Journalist To Make Space Flight

OW1212133189 Tokyo KYODO in English 1100 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 12 KYODO—A Soviet journalist will visit the Soviet space station "Mir" next August as the world's first spaceborne journalist, the visiting science editor of PRAVDA said Tuesday in a press meeting with Japanese reporters.

V.S. Gubarev of the Soviet party-run newspaper PRAVDA said the journalist's space flight is aimed at raising funds for charity for children. He said a selection committee of the Journalists' Union will select the first cosmonaut-journalist next July. He said the committee will first choose two candidates from among a field of nine men and two women by next March.

The Soviet Government earlier this year agreed to allow a Japanese journalist aboard a Soviet space station in 1991.

Gubarev said Soviet journalists proposed the project through a direct appeal to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, so that a Japanese would not be the first journalist to board a Soviet spacecraft.

Japan Firm Buys Mock-Up of Mir, Kvant Craft

PM1512160589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 4

[Feature comprising interview with Japanese industrialist Yutaka Horie by N. Tsvetkov in Tokyo; and interview with Soviet space official Ye. P. Sherstobitov by S. Butkov: "They Had To Pay for It"; date and place of interview not given]

[Excerpts]

Fact

A sensation has swept across Japan: The Horie Group trading company has bought the Mir space station and the Kvant space module from the USSR Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology for 1.4 billion yen (around $10 million). Our own correspondent in Tokyo N. Tsvetkov met with the the firm's president, Yutaka Horie.

Mr Horie is happy and excited and does not hide his satisfaction:

"I am the first person to make such a unique deal! Why did we make this deal? First, to show the Japanese that there is an opportunity for large-scale cooperation between our countries. In Japan, Mir will become a good symbol of our capability to hold an extensive, mutually beneficial dialogue.

"Second, it was useful to some extent to remind my fellow countrymen that the USSR is a great scientific and technical power to Japan too, despite all our economic 'miracles,' and it is no sin to learn something from one's neighbor. But the main thing is that I see Mir as a symbol of good-neighborliness and cooperation. Therefore I willingly accepted the Soviet side's proposal on the purchase." [passage omitted]

When the interview was over, Horie said with some solemnity:

"I'll let you into a secret. I've conceived a deal of which I have already informed the Soviet side—the construction of a tunnel under the sea which will link Primorye with Hokkaido. Can you imagine it? If we reach an agreement, this will be the greatest international project in history.

"A fantasy? Let's wait and see."

...and Commentary

We asked Ye. P. Sherstobitov, chief of department at the USSR Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology, to comment on the report from Japan:

[Sherstobitov] I want to make one thing clear straightaway: It was an exhibition model of the Mir space station and the Kvant space module that we sold to the Japanese firm.

[Butkov] And why did the Horie Group need this model?

[Sherstobitov] It's my opinion that Japan is a wealthy country, and it can afford it. There are many museums in Japan which deal extensively with the spheres of science and technology. I know, for instance, that there is a plan to open four such museums in Tokyo alone in the near future. In general, the Japanese give extensive publicity to their achievements in the sphere of cosmonautics. It stands to reason that space equipment interests them... So our model will be displayed in one of their museums.

[Butkov] If it is not a secret, how much did the Horie Group pay for the model?

[Sherstobitov] They paid $2.5 million.

[Butkov] We were given to understand that it was $10 million.

[Sherstobitov] We also received that incorrect information, as it happens. I can only suppose that it emanates from the Horie Group itself. Obviously this was done for self-publicity. We sold a full-scale model. It was made at the same workplaces where the regular articles are manufactured. So the labor-intensiveness of its manufacturing process was also quite considerable...

Mongolian 'Informal' Group Proposes Reforms

PM1412162089 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 3

[Own correspondent L. Arikh report under general heading "Squares With Microphones"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—The hundreds of people who gathered outside the Ulaanbaatar Palace of Youth building on 10 December witnessed an event that was very unusual for Mongolia.

Activists of the Mongolian Democratic Union, as yet the only informal social organization, held an authorized rally.

It was all very remarkable. The posters and banners, instead of the customary slogans of the "Long live..." variety, contained highly concrete demands beginning with the words "Down with!": the administrative edict style, the bureaucratic apparatus, special distribution, and so forth.

Those who approached the microphone, which on this occasion was indeed free, spoke of pressing matters: bureaucracy in state and social organizations, including the revolutionary youth league, and the excessively large number of dargs, that is, bosses, whom, as one speaker put it, the Mongolian working people have to feed, although they themselves have a low living standard. The speakers expressed dissatisfaction with the slow pace of restructuring in the republic.

The applause with which the demonstrators greeted nearly every speech by the Mongolian Democratic Union activists was evidence that the informals' demands meet with support among the broad masses. Many of these demands are to be found in a letter which it was decided to send to the Seventh Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee Plenum and the next session of the Mongolian People's Great Hural.

In the opinion of Mongolian Democratic Union activists, the new Mongolian constitution should contain provisions excluding the practice, established over many years, of party influence on state and government affairs and providing for the possibility of the existence of a multiparty system. The Mongolian Democratic Union proposes that the People's Great Hural become a permanent parliament, and that the most acute social, political, and economic problems affecting national interests be resolved through nationwide referendums. It is necessary, the letter goes on to stress, to radically change the Mongolian electoral system, to hold early general elections of People's Great Hural deputies, to formulate and submit for public discussion a socialist market concept, and to take the banking network out of the control of the republic Council of Ministers and make it accountable to the People's Great Hural.

The demonstrators' letter also contains the demand to form a social commission to identify and expose the people who "followed unprotestingly the policy of H. Choybalsan and Yu.Tsedenbal and thereby exacerbated their mistakes."

"We ask the party," the appeal says, "to draw appropriate political conclusions regarding the forcible formation 'from above' of the cooperative movement, the destruction of more than 700 temples and monasteries, historical and cultural monuments, and ancient books and manuscripts in the country, and the approval of the armed interference in the internal affairs of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968..."

This "petition" was handed over to a working party of the Seventh MPRP Central Committee Plenum, which was held on 11 December, the day after the rally. As yet it is hard to say what answers the Mongolian Democratic Union will receive to its demands, and in precisely what form. But some of the answers can already be found today in the materials from the plenum, at which problems of the party's socioeconomic policy at the present stage were discussed. As was, moreover, evidence of the correctness of what was said by a whole series of speakers at the rally.

For instance, those who spoke passionately about social injustice cannot but be gratified by the proposals made at the plenum regarding social security for particular strata of the population—large families, single mothers, orphans, and the elderly. Legal provisions were published for the first time on extending paid maternity leave to 2 years and on early retirement at their own wish for people whose length of service is sufficient but who have not reached pensionable age.

Delivering a report at the plenum, J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, put forward a number of new tasks in accelerating restructuring and giving dynamism to the processes of renewal of all spheres of social life. At the same time he admitted self-critically that among the factors retarding the renewal process is the fact that "first and foremost we have not succeeded in restructuring ourselves," and that "party ideological and organizational work is lagging behind present-day demands." Today, in formulating our economic and social policy, it is necessary to consult with the people and heed public opinion, the Mongolian leader stressed.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Meets With Lao General Secretary

LD1812220589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1751 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 18 Dec (TASS)—Today, M.S. Gorbachev met Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The Lao leader spoke of the processes of renewal in the country, at the center of which are the transition to primarily economic methods of managing the national economy and the equal development of all economic structures. The first positive results are on hand and the domestic market has expanded. Of course, the development is not taking place without problems. The LPRP is striving to objectively assess the social difficulties arising and to find timely ways to mitigate them. Phomvihan spoke of his recent visits to China, Japan, and France. The visits strengthened the republic's international position and helped integrate it into world economic relations, he said.

Gorbachev welcomed the Lao comrades' experience of applying the Leninist ideas of NEP [New Economic Policy] to the specific conditions of their country. That serves as yet another confirmation of the many possible ways of building a new society.

The Soviet leader informed Phomvihan of the present stage of perestroyka and of the work of the second USSR Congress of People's Deputies. "Contrary to various conjectures," he said, "we are also discussing and tackling closely the main task: how to reveal the economic, democratic, cultural, and simply human potential of socialism more fully under the current, specific conditions."

The CPSU and all Soviet people are invariably devoted to the socialist idea. The disputes today are mainly about how socialism can be ennobled, how it can be enriched by the achievements of all of modern civilization, and how the urgent socioeconomic difficulties can be overcome. It is true that there are some who are getting hysterical, predicting the "downfall of socialism," the failure of perestroyka. As is often the case, reactionaries close ranks with ultraradicals, disclaiming realistic constructive decisions. However, there is no turning the CPSU, the Soviet people, from the path of perestroyka.

The two sides emphasized the immense fundamental importance of maintaining positive processes in international relations. From the conceptual point of view, they touched upon the situation in the Asia-Pacific region where new political thinking and equal, mutually beneficial cooperation are gaining ground. Useful steps in this respect are also being made by the countries of Indochina.

Gorbachev and Phomvihan pointed out the importance attached by the Soviet Union and Laos to the steady, consistent development of relations with China.

Gorbachev and Phomvihan noted the trend that has begun in Southeast Asia from confrontation to dialogue. The main thing now is to prevent the escalation of civil war in long suffering Cambodia and to continue constructive talks between the interested sides.

The conversation passed in an atmosphere of comradeship and cordiality typical of Soviet-Lao relations.

Thai Policies on Cambodian Refugees Viewed

BK1612124489 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Station observer Yuriy Trushin commentary]

[Text] At the end of September all Vietnamese troops were withdrawn from Cambodia. However, it is regrettable that peace has not yet returned to Cambodia. This is the fault of the opposing Cambodian side and the foreign forces supporting it. The lives of Cambodian refugees in camps continue to be hard. The following are comments by our observer, Comrade Yuriy Trushin, on this issue.

As before, refugee camps in Thailand remain an important source of human and material resources for the opposing Cambodian groups. The opposing side usually gets fresh flesh and blood for its armed groups from there. According to evidence provided by international humanitarian organizations, the opposing side's fighting groups usually get a large chunk of the food and material aid provided to the refugees. These are the signs denoting camps under Khmer Rouge control. The United Nations was recently forced to cut down its aid to Cambodian refugees because in the end, that aid falls into the hands of the Pol Pot group. It is not often that the situation in camps controlled by Pol Pot is reported. The Khmer Rouge have been making efforts to prevent accidental visits to their camps by foreigners. Still, there have been reports that the refugees' lives there are pathetic. People who only aspire to lead a peaceful life have found themselves in a war situation. They are forced to give up their food, clothing, and money, and to let their male relatives and sons serve as soldiers of the Pol Pot group, which still nurtures the plan of returning to power in Cambodia. How should victims of Pol Pot's violence be assisted?

On this issue, a special role falls on Thailand whose position has been observed to be contradictory at times. One still remembers that this year Bangkok announced it had changed its attitude on Cambodian refugees—the essence of this was to prevent human rights abuses in refugee camps and to end the use of civilians in military operations by opposing Cambodian groups. Representatives of the Thai military command promised to separate armed men of opposing groups from civilians in all refugee camps and to set up plans for the latter's repatriation. Later, at the end of September, the Thai authorities announced that they will no longer allow their territory to be used by others to fuel a civil war in Cambodia and that all members of the three opposing groups' armed forces would be disarmed by the Thai military forces.

However, it is regrettable that Bangkok did not honor these promises. As before, Pol Pot men still conduct their criminal activities in refugee camps on Thai soil. All this was said, in conclusion, by our observer Comrade Yuriy Trushin.

Impact of Philippine Coup Analyzed

HK1612070989 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 15 Dec 89

[By Jakarta correspondent Vladimir Nabisorovko]

[Text] There are different views on the possible consequences of the rebellion mounted by some elements of the Armed Forces of the Philippines [AFP]. However, observers all agree that this latest attempt to seize political power from President Corazon Aquino will aggravate the country's political situation and undermine its financial and social interests.

President Aquino has strongly criticized Vice President Salvador Laurel for being involved in the coup d'etat. She also asserted that she will remain president of the country for the remaining 2 years of her term. The Philippines Congress has granted the president more powers through the declaration of a state of national emergency for 3 months.

Meanwhile, Laurel denied being involved in the aborted attempt to seize political power from Aquino but he did not hide his approval of some of the rebels' demands. It will be recalled that Laurel continues to criticize the government for its failure to resolve the problems confronting the Philippines. At the same time, he accused the Aquino Administration of total dependence on the United States. And this was proved by the United States during the crushing of the renegade soldiers' recent rebellion.

According to Laurel, President Aquino, now indebted to the Americans, will not be able to reject U.S. pressure to maintain the military bases in the Philippines. However, the issue will not be decided by the president but by the Senate, which is the leading opponent of the continued presence of military bases. Talks on the military bases were supposed to commence this month but have been postponed due to the coup.

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev Greets Gulf Cooperation Council

LD1712204189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has sent greetings to the heads of member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council of the Arab states of the Gulf. The message states:

Your Majesties and Highnesses, accept sincere greetings in connection with the holding of the conference of the Cooperation Council in Muscat. The natural desire of the Arabs for integration and codevelopment and for broad cooperation in the international arena is reflected in the activity of the Cooperation Council, a presitigious and influential regional organization.

I express the hope that the decisions adopted by you will promote the unblocking of conflict situations in the Middle and Near East on the basis of the balance of interests and the guarantee of equal security and peace for all peoples of the region.

I support the development of friendly relations and mutually-beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the member states of the Cooperation Council and I wish you success in the conference's work, and I wish the peoples of your countries further progress and prosperity.

East Europe

'Mass Riots' in Western Romania Reported

PM1812164389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Romania: Riots in Timisoara"]

[Text] Bucharest—Last Saturday and Sunday the city of Timisoara in western Romania became an arena of mass riots provoked by the house arrest and trial of the Romanian rights champion Laszlo Toekes, a Hungarian by nationality and a priest in the local Reformed Church. According to a resolution of the city court, the priest must move out of the house he occupies. Toekes has also been deprived of the possibility of performing church services. The case has received international publicity.

An attempt by 526 Timisoara residents to put a written request to the city committee of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] to revoke the court decision produced no results. A demonstration took place Saturday in front of the RCP city committee building with the participation of approximately 5,000 people. According to unofficial reports, water cannons were used against the demonstrators.

At approximately 0200 on Sunday believers holding lighted candles formed a living chain around the Reformed Church building in protest at the actions of the city authorities. Those who had circled the church were joined by groups of young people chanting slogans calling for a change in the country's leadership. According to unofficial data, militia attempts to disperse the crowd resulted in clashes during which a number of store windows were broken. Isolated shots were heard in the city...

The reports of a private nature issuing from Timisoara have not yet received an official interpretation. It is significant, however, that material on the need for Romanian citizens to strictly abide by the country's legislation and on their responsibility in the face of the law was repeatedly read out over Central Romanian Radio last Sunday without any comment.

Border Situation Remains 'Tense'

LD1912091389 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Sofia December 19 TASS—The situation near the Dunav Bridge border checkpoint on the Bulgarian-Romanian border remains tense, according to a BTA NEWS AGENCY report.

Trips from Bulgaria to Romania through the border post between the Bulgarian city of Ruse and the Romanian Giurgiu, on opposite banks of the Danube river, were suspended by the Romanian authorities unilaterally, without preliminary notification, at 2300 on Sunday. Only Soviet transit lorries and buses were allowed to pass. Other foreign vehicles were allowed to cross the border on Monday at 1130 for transit passage over the Romanian territory.

The Romanian side introduced almost the same restrictions on international railway travel. Only passengers of transit passenger trains with reserved seat tickets are allowed to cross the Romanian border.

The Romanian authorities' unilateral measures have created an abnormal situation at the Bulgarian-Romanian Dunav Bridge border post. Sixty Polish and 60 Bulgarian tourists were removed from the train in Giurciu on Monday and sent back to Bulgarian territory in freight trains. A Polish and a Bulgarian woman were beaten up by Romanian border guards.

The BTA news agency reports that the Bulgarian border authorities are taking the necessary steps to normalise the situation in the area of Ruse-Giurgiu border post, according to Kiril Lyzhovsky, chief of the Ruse border post.

Modrow Receives Head of Soviet Troops in GDR

LD1812195889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin, 18 Dec (TASS)—Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, today received Army General B. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces. There was an exchange of opinions on topical questions of the internal political situation in the GDR.

The measures taken by the GDR Government are aimed at strengthening the country's stability and should serve as a contribution to European security, H. Modrow noted. He expressed gratitude to Soviet soldiers for helping the Republic's national economy.

PRAVDA Notes Yakovlev Talks With GDR Leaders

PM1812142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Talks in Berlin"]

[Text] A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in Berlin on a working visit 14-15 December at the invitation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] leadership.

There were meetings with G. Gysi, chairman of the SED, H. Modrow, prime minister of the GDR coalition government and deputy chairman of the party, and H.J. Willerding, member of the SED Board Presidium, and representatives of the public.

During the detailed exchange of opinions with G. Gysi mutual interest was emphasized in stepping up interparty cooperation on a new basis, under conditions where both countries and both parties are in the process of renewal and of the struggle for a new quality for socialist society. There was talk of diversifying the forms of contacts and collaboration, expanding youth exchanges, and getting rid of all red tape in the organization of cooperation. It was noted that, for all the natural differences in the specific features of internal conditions in each country, for all the diversity of specific approaches and solutions and forms and methods of work, the actual process of the societies' renewal creates a healthy basis for mutual relations between the CPSU and the SED and the prerequisites for the further consolidation of solidarity in the interests of the Soviet and German peoples.

The dynamics of internal political development were viewed against the background of the in-depth changes and objective trends announcing themselves in the world and in Europe and in the policy establishing itself on the basis of the principles of the new political thinking.

Questions of interstate relations and the prospects of socioeconomic development were the topic of discussion at A.N. Yakovlev's meeting with H. Modrow. The complexity of the tasks facing the republic, the emotional pitch of recent weeks, and the complex legacy of the past, it was noted during the talk, do not cancel out the GDR's undoubted achievements or the republic's contribution to European normalization and the all-European process. The GDR has a solid material and spiritual potential for making successful and dynamic headway on the path of recovery and for scaling new heights in the economy, social life, politics, science, and culture. In this connection, the prospects for cooperation between the USSR and the GDR were examined.

Specific questions of collaboration in the international arena were discussed in A.N. Yakovlev's talk with H.J. Willerding.

A.N. Yakovlev familiarized the German comrades in detail on the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, described the work of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and briefed them on the CPSU Central Committee December (1989) Plenum. It was stressed that the course toward perestroyka, for all its costs, has justified itself in the main respect: Soviet society has firmly embarked on the path of democratization, glasnost, and the overcoming of man's alienation from production, power, and society. The CPSU intends to continue to follow this course.

The talks that took place during the visit showed that for its stable development it is important for the GDR to have progress on many salients—support for the process of renewal from the republic's broad masses, dialogue and consensus of all realistic, responsible forces and movements, respect for the GDR's sovereignty, a profound recognition by all those interested in promoting the ideas of all-European cooperation of the importance of the GDR's sovereign status for preserving the necessary conditions ensuring building of the common European home.

All these prerequisites actually exist. The historical task is to build life for the peoples, countries, and civilization not on the basis of a game of ambitions and emotions but on the basis of general human values, on the basis of morality and common sense.

It was stressed that the political core of everything connected with the question of German-German relations lies in how indivisible it is from the situation in Europe and throughout the world. The reality is such that the GDR long ago became an important factor in not only European, but also world politics. The transformations that have begun in the republic could become a stabilizing factor in relations in the broader context, too, and will show the special ability to resolve the most complex questions in favor of reason, consensus, compromise, and an understanding of all possible consequences of the alternatives that objectively exist here today.

This stabilizing role must continue to be preserved, for the sake of all Germans. Two states of a single nation are a viable alternative for development open to broad cooperation and rapprochement. It can be implemented within the framework and process of building a common European home, which rules out regression; its implementation should be spared politics mongering and be imbued with a profound and responsible policy and an awareness of the interests of all peoples of Europe.

Visiting FRG President, GDR Leaders View Ties

LD1812095689 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 18 TASS—Manfred Gerlach, acting chairman of the GDR State Council, Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, and Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the GDR Christian Democratic Union, had a meeting in Potsdam with Richard von Weizsaecker, the West German federal president.

Weizsaecker came to that ancient city for Christmas.

The sides had a sincere talk on future relations between the two German states, on their contribution to peace and on the building of a "common European home".

Cohesion of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany should not put a brake on European unity, but should contribute to its promotion. We, Germans, irrespective of whether we are discharging our duties in the GDR or the FRG, all want our allies to trust our word. The neighbours, including Poland, should not worry about their territories because the two German states are drawing closer together, Weizsaecker noted.

The West German president said that the German Democratic [as received] should be given economic and moral aid to help its reforms. However, he stressed that a sovereign state should not be told what it should do or should not do, that only citizens of the German Democratic Republic have this right.

All our allies believe—this is also exactly how I understood Secretary of State Baker here in Potsdam—that there will be a stable German Democratic Republic. The Soviet side also expects the GDR, as a member of the Warsaw Treaty, to remain loyal to its allied commitments. The forthcoming meeting with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, scheduled for Tuesday, will show even more clearly the responsibility of both German states, Hans Modrow pointed out.

Turning to relations between the two German states, the head of the GDR Government noted that there were promising prospects for expanding and deepening cooperation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR. "However, nobody should ignore the problems that were engendered by lively contacts beween citizens of the two states. This requires responsible and efficient actions on the part of both sides," Modrow stressed.

Foreign Ministry Official on German Reunification

PM1812124689 Paris LE FIGARO in French 13 Dec 89 p 2

[Article by Nikolay Afanasyevskiy, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry First European Department: "Germany's Reunification: A Premature Problem"]

[Text] This fall, which will probably go down in history as "the fall which shook the world," events have speeded up, raising a series of questions which require an urgent reply and a prediction about the future.

This was also the reason for the intensification of Soviet-French contacts. The leaders of the two countries exchanged opinions by telephone, through their personal respresentatives and through their ambassadors. In November, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas visited Moscow.

Until then, the situation in central Europe had been developing generally in a predictable way. In recent days, however, it has begun to take a turn which is worrying at times. "Old demons" have begun to reawaken, to cite a French expression.

The situation required an urgent meeting among leaders. Out of a concern for speed and efficacy, it took place not in one of the capitals but in the old city of Kiev, "halfway" between Paris and Moscow.

GDR-FRG

It was a very well chosen time. A very important meeting had just taken place between Mr Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush which seems to open a qualitatively new era in Soviet-U.S. relations. At the end of his visit to Kiev, President Mitterrand went to Strasbourg to take part in the EC summit, in his capacity as EC chairman. The fact that, to cite the Western countries' opinion, Mr Mitterrand gave his support to the results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Malta seems very important.

The Soviet Union and France have always agreed that the Helsinki process, in other words respect for the situation established in Europe at the end of the war—in the present case, the existence of the independent sovereign states of the FRG and GDR—and the inviolability of European borders are vital preconditions for security and stability in Europe.

It is obviously completely premature to talk of "Germany's reunification" or a "German confederation" at this stage, as is currently being done in Bonn. Furthermore, this amounts to endangering the balance which has hitherto enabled Europe to avoid conflicts and to establish confidence and cooperation. This means destabilizing not only the situation in the GDR but also the whole of European policy.

Nobody denies the special nature of relations between the GDR and the FRG. This special nature is accompanied by rights but also by special responsibility. It is impossible to solve inter-German problems without furthering the European process, overcoming the split between Eastern and Western Europe, transforming the present nature of relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, limiting conventional troops and armaments in Europe, and reducing them to a level of reasonable sufficiency.

In short, the question of inter-German relations can be raised in a constructive framework. But this requires interaction among the responsible powers in Eastern and Western Europe and among all countries which now feel deeply concerned by what is happening and which are worried about their future and the future of the positive processes which have been started in Europe.

If we refer to the statements made by Mr Gorbachev and Mr Mitterrand in the news conference which they gave in Kiev, there is again a deep mutual understanding between France and the Soviet Union on these fundamental questions.

I think that this will be of decisive importance for the establishment of a truly common European understanding and mutual confidence between East and West.

This confidence is now being seriously tested. And the Kiev meeting made a major contribution to obtaining constructive results.

Poll Shows GDR Citizens Oppose Reunification

LD1812175289 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Bonn December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin:

A recent public opinion poll in East Germany produced an unexpected result: seven out of every ten East Germans favour the preservation of the German Democratic Republic as a sovereign state. Only 30 percent want reunification with West Germany.

The poll was carried out from December 1-8 by the Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociology and Social Policy and the Institute of Public Opinion in Bielefeld, West Germany, at the request of the West German DER SPIEGEL magazine and Channel Two of West German Television.

More than 1,000 citizens were polled in East Germany's 15 districts, representing the entire political spectrum of the country.

Seventeen percent of them said they support the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, about seven percent support the Social Democratic Party, five percent support the "New Forum" and another five percent—the Liberal Democratic Party.

At the same time, the poll showed that almost half of the East German population—48 percent—are still uncertain about their political stand.

More than 80 percent described the current economic situation in the country as "very bad."

Ninety-eight percent called for the trial of political figures responsible for the state of affairs in the economy.

According to the poll, Prime Minister Hans Modrow is now the most popular political leader in the country, followed by Guenther Maleuda and Wolfgang Berghofer.

Reportage on SED Extraordinary Congress

SED Must 'Win Back' People's Trust

PM1912100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[Dispatch by own correspondents S. Baygarov, S. Zyubanov, and M. Podklyuchnikov: "At SED Extraordinary Congress"]

[Text] Berlin, 16 Dec—After a week's intermission the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] extraordinary congress, the first sitting of which took place 8-9 December, has resumed work here. It has shown that the party is succeeding in preserving its unity. The idea of disbanding the SED and founding a new party met with no support among the delegates.

At this morning's sitting greetings to the congress from the CPSU Central Committee general secretary were read out. The delegates greeted M.S. Gorbachev's kind wishes with applause.

The days since the first sitting of the extraordinary congress have passed under the sign of the discussion in party ranks of the renewal of the SED that is under way. Today NEUES DEUTSCHLAND published proposals for the debate on the party program prepared by the congress delegates and by scientists from the Academy of Social Sciences. They are titled "For Humanity and Democratic Socialism in the GDR."

The proposals speak of the crisis of administrative socialism and the chance of revolutionary perestroyka in the GDR.

The party's new statute was also a topic of the discussion under way in the SED. In recent days NEUES DEUTSCHLAND has published three drafts for the new statute.

Today the congress delegates were familiarized with the report on the reasons for the crisis in the SED and in society prepared by a group of members of the former SED Central Committee Politburo, which was dissolved early in writing. Professor M. Shumann, department chief at the International Relations Institute in Potsdam, a member of the commission for studying the reasons for the crisis in the party, delivered a report on this subject.

The entire party, the report says, has been affected by the results of the crisis now. All comrades are considered responsible to society for this. It is all the more important to note that there is no collective blame of any kind. It is an indisputable fact that the majority of Communists and all working people have for many years and even decades by their selfless labor created a new society which, despite many shortcomings, demonstrates achievements worthy of attention. It is a pity that some people are now questioning this joint labor.

The report points out that the 11th SED Congress did not use its opportunities to make amendments to the party course and elaborate a new policy that would really have been oriented toward people's interests and the ensuring of the GDR's existence. On the international plane the path to changes was indicated by the 27th CPSU Congress. The SED leadership, however, interpreted only superficially the natural processes of socialism's development outlined in the Soviet Union without understanding their importance.

Inasmuch as perestroyka in the USSR has in principle cast doubt on the practice and results of the administrative-edict system, the SED leadership has reacted to it with ostentatious arrogance and an overestimation of the GDR's national potential.

The congress heard a report from Professor D. Kliyn [name as transliterated], member of the working commission for preparing the extraordinary congress, on the strategy and theses for the party program and on the concept of democratic centralism and a report by W. Pohl [name as transliterated], deputy chairman of the board of the party and first secretary of the Magdeburg Bezirk [area] SED Committee, on the new party statute.

The delegates discussed the reports submitted. In their speeches they pointed out that the party is faced with complex new tasks. In renewing itself, it must win back the people's trust.

The congress is continuing its work.

PRAVDA Summarizes Gysi Report

PM1812155589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[Own correspondents S. Baygarov, S. Zyubanov, and M. Podklyuchnikov report: "Extraordinary Congress Over"]

[Text] Berlin, 17 Dec—The extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS] ended here today. The delegates decided on that name so as to emphasize both the continuity and the renewed character of the party, which has resolutely broken with command and bureaucratic methods.

Party chairman G. Gysi delivered the report on the party's current tasks to delegates.

At the beginning of the report he stated that the two German states can form a contractual community without threatening European stability by hasty and ill-considered actions and without giving the continent's other peoples grounds for concern. The unification of the two German states would be a solution for which no politician would assume responsibility. The lives of the GDR's citizens have not been in vain. By their efforts they have achieved self-determination and by their peaceful, democratic, popular movement they have opened up the possibility of creating a humanist, social alternative to the FRG.

At present, the report says, the party has approximately 1.7 million members. The impact of the extraordinary party congress will depend on how quickly primary organizations regain their vigor.

The party chairman dwelt in detail on questions of democratizing internal party life.

Moving on to foreign policy question, Gysi pointed out that the alliance with the Soviet Union is a foreign political and foreign economic issue on which the GDR's very existence depends. An opportunity is opening before us now to place our relations on a new and equitable basis. Equitability and noninterference in internal affairs are the important principles on which our party's relations with the CPSU and the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries in general are built.

Socialist renewal is an objective necessity. Our bitter experience of recent weeks and months confirms that M.S. Gorbachev was right when he said that life itself punishes the laggard.

The GDR, the party chairman went on, must assist the fundamental change in relations among the European states. This change must lead to demilitarization and democratization, diverse unity and joint progress, and the creation of the all-European home. Our party supports the alliance of the Warsaw Pact but advocates its democratization.

The Germans' future is in a joint Europe and therefore partnership in the interests of security should be created between the GDR and the FRG.

Those who seek a special German path to unification, the party chairman stated, are playing with fire. After two world wars Germans have a duty to do everything for peace and to prevent any destabilization.

The congress approved the draft new party statutes, which will operate until the next congress, and abolished the old statutes. The decision was taken to prolong the powers of the delegates should it become necessary to convene a new extraordinary congress, which could be held before the People's Chamber elections planned for 6 May next year. The congress statement was adopted unanimously.

In keeping with tradition, the congress ended with the singing of "The Internationale."

SED Fighting for Renewal, Regaining of Trust

90UI0203A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Dec 89 p 3

[Interview with Norbert Kertscher, first secretary of the Karl-Marx-Stadt District Committee of the SED, by SELSKAYA ZHIZN special correspondent A. Morgun: "Return the Trust of the People"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] **The extraordinary congress of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany], which began its work in Berlin last week, has already resolved one very important task: Elections of the new party leadership were held. The congress declared a decisive break with the policy of the former leadership and with authoritarian methods of control of the party and the country. A policy was adopted to create a modern socialist party. However, talks concerning the program and a possible change in the name of the party still lie ahead; the delegates will assemble again at the end of next week to continue their work. But, for the time being, the tasks that remain to be decided by the communists of the GDR in the near future are related in an interview with our special correspondent by Norbert Kertscher, a member of the new board of the party elected at the congress and first secretary of the Karl-Marx-Stadt district committee of the SED.**

[Kertscher] First of all, it must be clearly understood that the crisis in the ruling party, which the SED was until recently, could not help but entail a crisis in the country as a whole as well. There is practically not one sphere of public life that could be excluded from this general crisis situation. The concealed scales of corruption and the abuse of authority committed by a number of prominent officials turned out to be so stupefying that honest analysis led to one main conclusion: In its former capacity, each day the party injures itself more and more in the eyes of the people. That is why the periods for convening the extraordinary congress of the SED were speeded up to the maximum. Its main task was to prove that the party has the forces and the capability for renewal, and that it was able to do this in the most radical way.

[Morgun] Such a renewal can only be welcomed, but is not the tempo a little too fast? Because only several weeks have passed...

[Kertscher] It is important here to explain the overall situation. It happened that the party in the pre-congress period was, in fact, in confrontation with a powerful and mass democratic movement, which, I will note, began, alas, not on the party's initiative. As a matter of fact, it was precisely this movement that to a significant degree contributed to the liberation of the party from the scabs of lies and dogmas that shackled its activity and gave a push to the beginning of the process of self-cleansing. Well, and after starting this process, we sensed an apparent interest in accelerating it, both among the intelligentsia and the working class—the foundations of the party. Moreover, as it came to light, the mood of the primary party organizations turned out to be significantly more radical than at the "top." In the final analysis, it was this that led to the resignation of the Politburo and the Central Committee of the SED.

It is not possible not to take into account a different degree of radicalization of the party ranks in the future as well. An enormous number of opinions now exist about what the party should be like and how it should function in the future. Pluralism at times leads to confrontation and to differentiations in the social and party ranks. That is why the threat of a split still really exists in the party. To avoid this is one of the most pressing and important problems. Our congress will have to develop the kind of a program and the kind of concept that would satisfy the majority.

[Morgun] I know that many are awaiting the decision of the congress hopefully, but many, alas, decided that they could not wait: In several weeks several hundred thousand people left the party...

[Kertscher] Yes, there is that also. In our district, for example, approximately 35,000 communists put their party cards on the table—almost one-seventh of the organization. In addition, it was noted: Each new report on cases of criminal activity of the former party leadership leads to a new wave of mass exits from the ranks of the SED.

[Morgun] This phenomenon is also observed in our country, although not on these scales. True, it is monotonously explained that in large part it is the scum, they say, that is leaving the party, those who in their time enrolled in it because of career considerations...

[Kertscher] In our situation, such an explanation would seem to be oversimplified. Of course, there are careerists among those leaving the party, people who understand that it is not advantageous to remain in the party now. But I would not say that these are a majority. According to our data, among those leaving there are quite a few people who in their time firmly and strictly—by virtue of party discipline—executed the instructions of the former leadership. Now they see with their own eyes what this led to. And so they leave the party, disenchanted with those principles on which it was based previously. There is also another category: Those who cannot bear the peculiar psychic attack by an environment that is hostilely inclined toward the party. Indeed, to be the member of a party that made quite a few mistakes and to be responsible for its activity, inasmuch as you belong to it—this is not easy, and not something that everyone is up to.

[Morgun] A lot is being said now about the renewal of the party. What is meant by this?

[Kertscher] In the first place, a rejection of that policy which it professed until recently, and a rejection of party dogmas. The party should be open to society, and its objectives and actions should be understandable and clear to everyone. Many of our party members, for example, interpreted the repeal of that article of the Constitution which talked of the guiding and directing role of the party as a surrender of principles. The informals, to the contrary, exulting, talked about the fact that this became possible only due to pressure and the aggressiveness of the masses. I think neither is correct. In my opinion, the repeal of this article of the Constitution simply stated what was already obvious even without this: At a given moment, the party actually lost its leading role. That happened which could happen and does happen, incidentally, in many countries: If the authority given by the people is used irresponsibly, then it is no wonder that it is lost quickly.

[Morgun] How would you evaluate the composition of delegates elected at the extraordinary congress?

[Kertscher] Here I have a right to make a judgment only about our district organization. Thus, up until now we never before had elections like those at our congress. Discussions in the party organization lasted 7-10 hours, and several dozen people spoke during each discussion. Moreover, the tone of the speeches was constructive for the most part: People had many interesting proposals and ideas. This enables me to express the confidence that the thirst for renewal will also stand out in all decisions of the congress.

[Morgun] And the last thing. You became a member of the board of the party, and 92 percent of the delegates of the congress voted for you. I would like to ask you, at least briefly, to introduce yourself to the readers of SELSKAYA ZHIZN.

[Kertscher] Well, there are no secrets. I am 35 years old. I began my work activity as a teacher of history and the German language. Afterwards I studied in Berlin in the Academy of Social Sciences. I started in executive party work relatively recently. Since December of last year I have headed a rayon committee of the party, and a month and a half ago I became the first secretary of a district committee of the SED.

Believe me, I am not dramatizing when I say that the party has a last chance now to return the trust of the people. I and people sharing my views will try to do everything possible to make good use of it.

[Morgun] Thank you for the interview.

GDR Democratic Awakening Party's Popularity Noted

LD1812095589 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 18 TASS—The Constituent Congress of the Democratic Breakthrough [Democratic Awakening] Party ended in Leipzig around midnight. Established last October, it is one of the youngest political organisations in the German Democratic Republic.

However, it has already won popularity. The Congress noted that the party unites about 100,000 people.

The debate on the programme and the rules of the new party and its approach to tackling important important domestic issues lasted two days. Yes or no to socialism? Should the party seek Germany's reunification? Should the Modrow govenment be supported? These and many other questions evoked heated discussions.

Most delegates were convinced that socialism has not exhausted itself as a social system and has many untapped reserves which can be used to create a democratic alternative to capitalist West Germany.

However they said that it is necessary to be more resolute in abandoning its present strictures, to be bolder in introducing progressive forms of the capitalist economy into socialist life and to develop private property on a broader scale, including enterprises rejected with foreign participation.

Delegates resolutely rejected a demand on the government's resignation. Such a step would increase political destabilisation and result in further deterioration of the economic situation and growth in social tension, the congress stressed.

A large group of statesmen from West Germany, including Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, were present at the Congress as guests.

Elections to the party's board were held at the end of the congress. Lawyer Wolfgang Schnur was again elected its chairman. He won a wafer-thin victory over Leipzig physician Sonja Schroeter, collecting 118 votes.

The leader of the new party is 45 years old. He was independent until now. Schnur won popularity as defence lawyer at political trials.

The Democratic Breakthrough Party intends to actively participate in the elections scheduled for May 6.

Planned CSSR Military Cuts Reported

PM1812160789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Kornilov: "CSSR: Prague Abounds With News"]

[Text] Political activity continues to seethe in the Czechoslovak capital a week before the Christmas holiday.

The results of the election of delegates to the Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] are being reported. There will be 496 workers, 116 agricultural workers, 308 engineers and managerial workers, and 153 scientists and educationalists. The request by party members from the Democratic Communist Forum that its representatives attend the congress has been granted.

CSSR Minister of National Defense M. Vacek spoke at a news conference of the substantial changes in the army planned to start in the new year. The ministry has proposed to the government that the length of military service be reduced from 24 to 18 months. The federal premier's prior assent to this has been obtained. The decision is to come into force 2 January. The activity of CPCZ organizations in all army subunits is to be wound up and the structure of the political apparatus in the Armed Forces eliminated as of the same day: They will function without the participation of political parties, movements, and the church. The number of reserve servicemen annually called up for training will be cut by 90,000. To build confidence and strengthen stability in Europe the army command is proposing to the government that there be discussion of the possible dismantling of artificial technical barriers along the whole length of the border with Austria and the FRG. Our army, M. Vacek said, does not need them for defense purposes.

The well-known industrialist T. Bata, who is visiting Czechoslovakia, has been received in Prague by M. Calfa, head of the CSSR Government. Responding to a direct question from journalists as to whether there was discussion during the meeting of the possible return to the Bata company of part of its nationalized property, Bata said that, in his opinion, it was today too early to talk about government policy in that direction. A commission of specialists has been set up jointly with the company which will work on how to improve Czechoslovak footwear. On 16 December Bata visited Zlin. Do not look for this name on maps produced in recent decades—since the fifties the city has been named Gottwald in honor of the CPCZ leader. Its orginal, historical name has now been restored by decision of the regional national committee. Svit, the country's largest shoe enterprise, which was created by the Bata family and belonged to it, is located in Zlin.

Prague stores are extremely busy at the moment... Christmas is very near and traditional presents for relations, friends, and acquaintances are needed. There are lots of people, but the shelves are not empty. The other day, Kotva, Prague's largest department store, sold goods worth Kcs 11.4 million, a record sum in its 14 years of existence.

Civic Forum Stance on CSSR Elections Described

PM1812165989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[V. Rzhevskiy and V. Yaroshevskiy dispatch: "Czechoslovakia. Electoral Struggle"]

[Text] Prague, 15 Dec—The inhabitants of Prague have not been stopping to look for Christmas presents in the brightly decorated department store windows during the past few days. Today politics rules everything and everyone, TASS correspondents report from Prague. Vaclav Havel—one of the leaders of the "Civic Forum" movement—smiles down from colorful posters to potential voters. And although no one has officially announced an election campaign, it is in fact going ahead at full speed. It must be said that it is difficult to avoid getting the impression that the dice are loaded. The other candidates for the presidency, Ladislav Adamec, Alexander Dubcek, and Cestimir Cisar, were all represented much more modestly on the brightly colored palette of publicity on the walls.

Until now there has been no unity among the main political forces in society on key questions such as the procedure and date for the election of a president. A "roundtable" with the participation of the interested parties has not brought concrete results in this connection either. The following question can be heard with increasing frequency: Why does "Civic Forum" ignore demands to hold nationwide elections for the head of state, which four-fifths of the country's population support, but insist on a president being elected by Federal Assembly deputies? Opinions vary, but it so happens that the existing situation is safe for "Civic Forum." This is the logic: Unless Parliament elects V. Havel, it will not fulfill the will of the people and will have to be completely replaced, and if the "Forum" candidate wins, this will be additional testimony to his popularity.

This opinion, in particular, was stressed at yesterday's rally outside the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee building in Prague organized by the "Democratic Forum of Communists." Thousands of party members participated in it. Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, addressed those gathered. His speech was not planned, and so the party leader spoke from an improvised platform constituting a truck that had been standing nearby. "Our main task for the moment is to elect a president of the republic," K. Urbanek stated. "The Communist Deputies' Club in parliament has advocated direct general elections. This is not a stratagem, as some people are trying to prove, but a step that corresponds to the democratic spirit of the country's contemporary political life."

The "Civic Forum" press spokesman, L. Dobrovsky, said at a press conference that if there were a national referendum "Civic Forum" would want all the voters to vote for V. Havel. Whereas this news conference was just one of a countless number, Jiri Dienstbier's meeting with journalists yesterday was his first as head of the CSSR Foreign Ministry.

The head of the foreign policy department touched on problems that have fundamental significance for the republic. He stressed, in particular, that Czechoslovakia's aim is identical to the aspirations of the other Warsaw Pact states, namely, to dissolve the two opposing military blocs. But this can be achieved not by single actions, but by achieving a common understanding among all the parties to the Helsinki process, Dienstbier stressed. He also noted that the CSSR has no reason to leave CEMA. In response to a question on Czechoslovak-Soviet relations at the present time, the minister said that their status was now more favorable than in previous years, when the Czechoslovak leadership's policy contradicted M.S. Gorbachev's policy. Condemning the military intervention in Czechoslovakia was an important precondition for eliminating existing obstacles.

Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Congress Held

New Party Chairman Elected

LD1812095189 Moscow TASS in English 0636 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 18 TASS—The first stage of the 14th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party [MSZMP] ended late at night on Sunday.

The delegates discussed and adopted the party rules and elected the new leadership—the Central Committee, the Secretariat and deputy party leaders. Gyula Thurmer was elected party chairman.

The second stage of the 14th congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party will be held late in January, early in February 1990. The party's political statement is planned to be discussed and adopted.

Deputy Chairmen Elected

LD1812164889 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 18 TASS—The Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (HSWP) [MSZMP] elected today deputy chairmen of the party. They are Sandor Nyiro, Attila Pozsonyi and Tibor Koy.

The HSWP Secretariat was also elected. It consists of eleven people. The HSWP Central Committee comprises 28 people including such politicians as Karoly Grosz, Janos Berecz, Frigyes Puja and Robert Ribanzki.

Poland's Walesa Visits Moscow, Honors Sakharov

LD1912015989 Warsaw PAP in English 2332 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 18—Bad weather conditions prevented Solidarity leader Lech Walesa from arriving on time to attend Andrey Sakharov's funeral ceremonies in Moscow. He arrived here late in the evening when the funeral was already in progress. According to the will of Sakharov and his widow Yelena Bonner, the funeral was attended only by the family and his closest friends.

From the airport Lech Walesa went straight to the Vostryakovsky Cemetery in front of which he was greeted by head of the newly-formed Democratic Party Oleg Brumel. The Solidarity leader came to Sakharov's grave when others were dispersing. Walesa, accompanied by Adam Michnik and Edward Wende, laid a V-shaped wreath made of red and white flowers. The ribbon read: To a great Russian, to a great defender of human rights from the Solidarity chairman.

In the wake of the funeral, Walesa told PAP that he was upset because of his being late, and added that his first thought was that such a great man was buried at such an humble place.

"This is a loss for the reforms, a loss for perestroyka. At this moment, in this country he was the only one with such a great authority. I feel sorry, I waited for his invitation, for a meeting. I thought that we would do something together but he is gone. It is a great loss," Walesa said.

"I was standing at the grave of a man who was Russia's conscience, who was the conscience of Europe and who played a special role for people of my generation," said Adam Michnik who accompanied Walesa.

Meeting of Remembrance in Rossiya Hotel

In the evening, Lech Walesa attended a meeting of remembrance to Andrey Sakharov in the Rossiya Hotel here. Over 500 persons took part in the gathering, among them USSR people's deputies and mainly members of the Inter-Regional Group.

Lech Walesa conveyed his condolences to Sakharov's widow Yelena Bonner. Mrs Bonner thanked Lech Walesa with tears in his eyes for his coming to Moscow to the funeral.

Speaking on behalf of the Polish Solidarity, Lech Walesa said: "I wanted to come to your country in different circumstances. The fate, however, changed those plans. I met him once in Paris and I pinned great hopes on this outstanding man. The reform needed him badly, not only in your country but in entire Eastern Europe. For us, he was the conscience of your grand nation.

"It is a great pity that there is no Professor Sakharov anymore. Do replace him—such is the requirement of the moment. I wish you that we do not depart from this road, the road of perestroyka. Let us preserve Professor Sakharov in our memory as a precursor of this direction. The memory of him will never die," Walesa said.

Walesa also held numerous talks with people's deputies: Boris Yeltsin, Yuriy Afanasyev, Roald Sagdeyev, Galina Starovoytova and others. He also met with the only non-party minister in the Soviet cabinet Nikolay Vorontsov who is in charge of nature protection. The message from these talks is that perestroyka in the USSR backs reforms in Poland while reforms in Poland back perestroyka.

Poland's Ambassador to the USSR Stanislaw Ciosek was present at the meeting.

West Europe

Further on Shevardnadze Brussels Visit, EC Talks

18 Dec Activities

LD1812231189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR Foreign Minister, started his visit to Belgium.

[Reporter K. Mazheyka] Brussels is a lively European crossroads and a unique barometer of the world's political climate. It is a cosmopolitan city and a triple—Belgian, Atlantic, and West European—capital. Thirteen years have passed since a Soviet diplomat of the comparable rank visited it. That is a long time. It is not surprising that Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's arrival here has generated great interest.

The program for the USSR foreign minister's visit started with a meeting with Martens, head of the government cabinet. The exchange of views focused on the issues of all-European construction and also on those of bilateral relations. Comrade Shevardnadze voiced proposals in favor of creating a new economic order in Europe and set forth our position on some aspects of this and other topical tasks. He showed interest in the varied Belgian experience in the area of the state's federal structure. [Video shows Shevardnadze and Martens in conversation]

At the Palais Royal, the residence of the head of state, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze was received by Baudouin I, King of Belgium. In 1975, he and Queen Fabiola visited our country. [Video shows Shevardnadze and the king]

During the visit, a joint Soviet-Belgian declaration and other documents aimed at developing bilateral cooperation were signed. This subject dominated talks between Comrade Shevardnadze and Belgian Foreign Minister Eyskens. On their completion, a meeting with journalists took place. Diplomatic contacts between our countries, it was mentioned, had been established more than 50 years ago. Pauses and slumps and simply alienation took place in the recent past, but this was rather an anomaly. A mutual desire for strengthening the tissue of bilateral relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, good-neighborliness and mutual respect made a certain contribution to the fact that, eventually, a road to Helsinki and cooperation on the all-European basis was paved. [Video shows Shevardnadze and Eyskens surrounded by journalists]

How do you see the role of the Soviet Union in this process? This was my question to Wilfried Martens, Belgian prime minister, right after this meeting.

[Begin recording] [Martens in French with superimposed Russian translation] The very fact that today the head of Soviet diplomacy will sign an agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation with the EC and the Euratom for 10 years is a graphic illustration of its importance. This is an exceptionally important turning point toward rapprochement between the USSR and our international association. The process of democratic reforms that is under way in central and Eastern Europe serves as a good stimulus for consolidating such a positive tendency. Its further development leads toward extending mutually advantageous contacts to the political and social spheres. [end recording]

Shevardnadze, Eyskens Hold Talks

LD1812195389 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 18 TASS—Talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Belgian Foreign Minister Mark Eyskens ended in the Egmont Palace in Brussels. They concentrated on the development of the positive tendencies that have emerged in world politics and in Europe lately.

Shevardnadze stressed the need to overcome the rift on the European continent and to take steps towards a radical reduction of armaments to the lowest possible level of defence sufficiency.

The ministers expressed satisfaction with the progress in disarmament achieved during the Soviet-American summit off Malta.

Shevardnadze and Eyskens exchanged opinions about the progress of the European process. They also discussed other issues of international life and Soviet-Belgian relations.

Shevardnadze Discusses EC Accord

LD1812233189 Moscow TASS in English 2258 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 19 TASS—The Soviet Union and the European Community signed a trade and economic cooperation agreement on Monday.

The agreement was signed by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas and Frans Andriessen, deputy chairman of the Commission of the European Communities.

The ceremony was also attended by EC Commissionn Chairman Jacques Delors, the foreign ministers of EC members and Soviet officials.

At the ceremony Shevardnadze said:

"The agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Community is not an ordinary document, it is innovative by the strictest standards.

"Its nature reflects the vigorous dynamics of the renewal processes in Europe. Its content raises the practical construction of the economic foundation of a common European home one step higher.

"The political importance of this document is emphasised by the presence of the foreign ministers of the twelve EC members at the signing ceremony.

"Overcoming our biased approaches we came to the conclusion that integration in Western Europe is not only a reality but is also a major European economic and foreign-policy factor.

"Our cooperation with the European Community is a future- oriented channel of adapting to one another and overcoming the disunity of the continent, of course, with the participation of our partners in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which can only be welcomed.

"We regard the scale and depth of the integration cooperation in the European Community and the radical restructuring of the Soviet economy, with its active involvement in world economic ties, as a real basis for interaction between the EC members and the Soviet Union, for bringing their economies closer together and making them supplement one another.

"We note with satisfaction that such a mandate has been largely implemented in this agreement. I would like to point to the scale and comprehensive nature of the agreement which covers various spheres, such as economy, science, technology and the environment.

"Gratitude should be expressed to all those who worked for the agreement to gain precisely such content. The agreement also worthily crowns France's EC chairmanship.

"Now the agreement is to be put into practice and sectoral arrangements are to be worked out. We are ready for it and we intend to continue to work in earnest, maintaining the high tempo and the spirit of creative cooperation.

"The agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Community is imbued with a considerable political and, I would say, conceptual charge of a major European plan for the future.

"It gives food for collective thinking and practical approaches to the gradual formation of an integral economic complex on the continent.

"Of course, this is a long-term and uneasy objective. It makes us face many challenges. But the movement has begun.

"We are convinced that the integration potentials that have shaped up and are developing in the West and the East should be fully tapped. These processes may become a factor not dividing but uniting our continent.

"To this end, the inertia of bloc thinking, self-centeredness and group exclusiveness should be further overcome. Our relations should be transformed from confrontation, the building of barriers and 'fortresses' into interaction, partnership and mutual penetration, I would say.

"It is important that the new forms of our ties accord with the logic of the formation of common European economic space.

"The fact that the development of the integration groups in both parts of Europe differs in pace and depth should not be an insurmountable obstacle in the search for common ground and cooperation.

"We have already proposed setting up a European trilateral commission with the participation of the European Community, the European Free Trade Association and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

"Four hundred years ago, prominent Flemish cartographer Gerardus Mercator proposed new, mathematically substantiated principles for making geographical maps. He was the first to issue a European atlas. The introduction to the atlas was immediately translated in Russia.

"Now we'll have to jointly work on the political, economic, cultural and moral coordinates of a new Europe, to create an atlas of the European Community of the 21st century."

Deputy Minister Obminskiy on EC Accord

LD1812131789 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—"The accord with the European communities is an example of a new approach to East-West cooperation based on overcoming ideological and political stereotypes and on achieving the compatibility of our economies," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Ernest Obminskiy told TASS on the eve of the conclusion of an agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities (EEC and Euratom) in Brussels today.

The agreement will be signed on behalf of the Soviet Government by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

"Considering the near prospect of the formation of a 'single internal market' of the communities, the lack of such a document would make that market still less accessible to us by 1993," Obminskiy said.

"The agreement applies the highest possible degree of liberalisation to mutual imports. In so doing the European Communities undertake to ensure before 1995 a stage-by-stage lifting of 1,500 quantitative restrictions on import from the Soviet Union and to cancel 600 and suspend 100 of them during the first year after the agreement enters into force.

"As a result, conditions for Soviet exports to the market of the European Communities will gradually lose their current discriminatory character beginning from 1990.

"Under the agreement the Soviet Union reserves the right to grant customs privileges to the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and to developing countries."

Having described in detail specific areas of cooperation provided for by the agreement, Obminskiy emphasised that the agreement also regulates arbitration, customs business, the protection of intellectual property, re-export, transit, exhibition activities, and assistance to business people.

"Provision is made for measures to regulate the competition and ensure the economic security of the partners. We have virtually managed to achieve a weakening of the impact of the Cocom list on reciprocal trade by using clear-cut and universally recognised GATT rules."

Speaking of the Soviet side's commitments under the agreement, he said the Soviet Union undertakes not to permit discrimination with regard to imports from the European communities concerning the application of quantitative limitations, the issuance of licenses and distribution of currency to pay for such imports.

"Supplement three to the agreement stipulates the Soviet side's obligation to facilitate the work of the business people of the European Communities in the Soviet Union on a non-discriminatory basis.

"This would take account of the provisions of the Final Act and concluding documents of subsequent follow-up meetings within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the current economic reform," Obminskiy said.

"These provisions of the agreement are undoubtedly of much interest to the European Communities, since their implementation would lead to markedly improved conditions for their commercial activities on the Soviet market.

"Besides, the elaboration of such spheres as scientific and technical cooperation or, for example, the activities of joint ventures, is of course of mutual interest," he said.

"The entering of the agreement into force would furnish a legal basis for the establishment of all-round trade and economic cooperation with the European communities.

It would also seal the most-favoured-nation trading status and mark the beginning of the lifting of discriminatory restrictions on Soviet exports to the European communities, which undoubtedly meets the foreign economic interests of the Soviet Union," Obminskiy emphasised.

In a broad sense, he said, this agreement is important as an illustration of international recognition of the new foreign economic relations mechanism being shaped in the Soviet Union during perestroika.

The conclusion of the agreement will be a big step in the formation of a European economic environment and the building of a "common European home", Obminskiy said.

Further on EC Agreement

LD1912072489 Moscow TASS in English 0712 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov:

The conclusion of an agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Communities on trade and commercial and economic cooperation has become possible due to new conditions that objectively reflect the processes taking place in Europe, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told a news conference here on the occasion of the signing of this document.

This event, he said, is the result of efforts being made by the peoples of Europe to overcome military and political confrontation and to overcome the economic division of the European continent.

"We are witnessing a historic phase when one can boldly say that the cold war is over and we are entering a period of peaceful development.

"The just signed agreement is opening up wide prospects for mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities.

"It removes many things that for decades hindered the development of equal relations between our countries.

"I think that a very important and large amount of work is being started in this respect to create conditions for the solution of all those problems that now face Europe and to provide guarantees for ensuring stability and peaceful creative labour of our peoples."

The agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Communities contains huge potentialities and opens up broad vistas, Roland Dumas, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities and French foreign minister, emphasised at the news conference.

It will promote not only a sharp increase in goods exchanges but also the Soviet Union's integration into the international economic system, he added.

This document is of no less political importance, since it fits into the overal process of the East's and West's drawing closer together, an impetus to which has been given by the policy of perestroyka being pursued by the Soviet Union, Dumas said.

Congress of People's Deputies

Ryzhkov Threatens To Resign If Program Rejected

LD1912071489 Moscow TASS in English 0707 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov has offered to stand down if the continuing Second Congress of People's Deputies rejects his government's economic programme.

In an interview with SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Sunday, Ryzhkov said that he bears responsibility for his programme. "I believe in it," Ryzhkov told the newspaper.

Attempts are being made "to drive a wedge between Ryzhkov, who is alleged to be more conservative, and Abalkin and other Council of Ministers Presidium members," Ryzhkov charged.

Ryzhkov defended his drive to "restore order in the country". He said this should be done through both economic and administrative measures.

"Economic levers are not yet working properly and levelling continues to flourish. If the country embarks on the road suggested by us, it will be possible to restore order," he said.

Ryzhkov then lashed out at Academician Georgiy Arbatov's speech at the Congress in which he urged the deputies "to reject Ryzhkov's plan".

Ryzhkov said Arbatov's behaviour was "tactless", since he kept silent when Ryzhkov submitted the government's programme at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

Defends Program

PM1812162189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, by S. Karkhanin under the rubric "Interview After the Sitting": "Vector of Stability"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] As is well known, the debate on the government report has ended at the Congress; USSR People's Deputies now have to adopt a resolution. What form will it take? In many respects the effectiveness of the economic reform depends on this. An interview which N.I. Ryzhkov gave SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA following his speech discusses the stance of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, more and more often here at the congress one can hear people say that the government leadership is not united in its approach to the concept of reform, and a great deal is being said about "disappointed expectations." The polemics here at the congress showed the dissent among deputies. What comment can you make here?

[Ryzhkov] Certainly, there is a noticeable line aimed at driving a wedge between Ryzhkov, who is allegedly more conservative, and Abalkin and other members of the Council of Ministers Presidium. But the document is our collective work, we have brooded over it for several months now, counting up, considering, and pondering all the options. I told Academician G.A. Arbatov today, and I am prepared to repeat it once again: I signed the document and I am prepared to answer for it.

We must restore order in the country. Moreover, we must utilize both economic and administrative measures. It is no secret that economic levers are still not operating properly and leveling is still flourishing. Thus, if the country chooses the path we have proposed, it will prove possible to restore order.

Take the state order. Succumbing to public opinion, we made a mistake last year. It turned out that a machine builder received a state order of 25 percent while an oilman received one of 95 percent. How can petroleum be extracted if there is a shortage of equipment? As of 1991 we want to spend 2 years with a different system: 90 percent for everyone. We will set up a market from the remaining 10 percent, although it will be very difficult. This 10 percent will not fall to anyone who so chooses... But the combination of administrative and economic measures will be effective.

[Karkhanin] You are probably aware of people's dissatisfaction over the wage "freeze." This does indeed square badly with the policy of boosting people's standard of living...

[Ryzhkov] In November the rise in income reached 13 percent, while that in output production totaled 0.6 percent... How can we balance the market? What economy can withstand this? In the first 11 months this year commodity turnover was 10 percent, this has never been the case in our lifetime! All manner of rumors and instability in society are causing people to scoop everything from the shelves without thinking whether they need a particular commodity. Of course, those people who have a fixed salary do not have such a rise in income. But there is a definite category of people who do.

[Karkhanin] But how would you view Academician Arbatov's speech, which has had a very significant response?

[Ryzhkov] At the CPSU Central Committee plenum I, as a Politburo member, reported on the program which the government is proposing. And I think that the plenum participants were right when they expressed their attitude toward it and supported our concept. But Comrade Arbatov was sitting there, too! Why did he not stand up? He should have said: Comrade Ryzhkov, I do not support your program. But he didn't! He only spoke out here. That, in my view, is improper. Why he did that I do not know.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, the problem of discipline now affects not only plan commitments but also each person's work at his own workplace. How are the disorganization, mismanagement, and pointless time losses in production to be eliminated?

[Ryzhkov] We must find ways and adopt a more rigorous approach. No one now, of course, will fire you for turning up 5 minutes late. But if you are not working then you must always remember that you should get out. We have forgotten that, it seems to me.

[Karkhanin] But what about the covert millionaires, rumors of whom are alarming people?

[Ryzhkov] Recently I answered that question from people's deputies. According to the statistics of the Ministry of Finances, the maximum deposit of money recorded in the Soviet Union is R200,000. But there is a point to be made here. Do you remember the sensational story of Artem Tarasov, who had R3 million? I thought that society's reaction to that would be very negative. But suddenly people began to praise and exalt Tarasov... Who exalted him, did I? No, it was the press. Is that the kind of "ideology" we have today? One in which people say, go on, earn millions, you will be leaders of organizations.

Incidentally, you do not know, do you, how much the people's deputy election campaign cost some candidates? R80,000. And of course R80,000 can be "deducted" from R3 million...

[Karkhanin) Are you confident that the congress will support your program?

[Ryzhkov] I cannot speak for the deputies. Especially since I feel that the mood of the hall changes very quickly. Like the waves. Now implacability, now support. Nevertheless, I think that there is too much emotion.

[Karkhanin] But what will happen if the program doesn't receive congress' support?

[Ryzhkov] Others will produce a new program. Then it will not be Ryzhkov who mounts the platform but someone else. I am answerable for my program and I believe in it.

'Heated Debates' on Economic Reform Draft

LD1912124689 Moscow TASS in English 1138 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] [No dateline as received]—Heated debates again erupted shortly before the draft resolution on the government's economic reform was put to a vote at the Second Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow today.

Some deputies criticised the proposed draft resolution. Agrarian Deputy Vladimir Fisinin described it as declarative.

Writer Chingiz Aitmatov suggested including in the resolution the need to give an economic and legal basis to culture.

Yuriy Romanov, of the Young Communists' League, pointed to a wide variety of views on the government programme. It is difficult, he said, to prepare a programme to suit everyone, but something should be endorsed.

Despite some deficiencies of the government programme, there is no alternative, the deputy said, proposing that congress adopt the resolution.

Some of the speakers expressed dissatisfaction with the programme and moved to take it into consideration without it being formally endorsed.

Disagreeing, Navy Admiral Vladimir Chernavin stressed that "this effectively amounts to passing a no-confidence vote in Nikolay Ryzhkov's government." "Today there are no grounds to disbelieve the government."

A few minutes before the vote a Moscow engineer, Yuriy Andreyev, made a third proposal. He suggested that the congress pass a vote of no confidence in the government for the measures of economic revitalisation which fall short of radical economic reform and postpone even further real improvement in living standards.

Before the vote Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov addressed the deputies. He urged the congress to express a firm view and not to dodge evaluating the government programme.

During a roll-call vote, 1,532 deputies voted for, 419 against and 44 abstained.

Alternative proposals were then put to a vote. A total of 389 deputies voted for the proposal to take the government programme into consideration, 1,532 were against and 64 abstained.

Yuriy Andreyev's proposal to pass a vote of no confidence was rejected by 1,685 votes to 199, with 98 abstentions.

Slyunkov Urges Adoption of Plan

LD1912075389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] The seventh day of work for the Congress of USSR People's Deputies began 30 minutes ago in the Kremlin.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is chairing the session, gave the floor to Deputy Slyunkov, chairman of the editorial commission, to work out resolutions on measures to improve the economy, the stages of economic reform, and principle approaches to working out the 13th 5-Year Plan. He noted that the work of the commission has taken into account more than 1,200 proposals, received in the course of debates. The majority of deputies approved the government program.

Proposals to extend measures to improve the economy and to accelerate the adoption of a packet of priority legislative bills were taken into consideration. Comrade Slyunkov proposed that the congress adopt the program of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The deputies have begun speaking and making specific proposals with regard to that resolution.

Congress Approves Ryzhkov Program

LD1912093289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0908 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 19 Dec (TASS)—The TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies has given majority backing today to the government's program on improving the economy and on the stages of economic reform and to the government's concept for working out the plan for the country's economic development for 1991-1995. This decision was made despite of attempts by a number of deputies to remove the formula for approval from the resolution.

The program has been discussed in detail for 4 days at the Congress. It had supporters and opponents. What is more, criticism came from both "the right" and "the left." The former asserted that the government was under the thumb of those economists who favor unconditional freedom of the market. The latter accused the government of lacking sufficient boldness in carrying out reforms. There was also a call to express a vote of no confidence in the government.

During the debates, a number of speakers insisted on taking cognizance of the government program while not approving it. However, many deputies detected in this an attempt to evade responsibility for implementing the government program and did not approve such an approach.

In the vote on the draft resolution, 1,532 were in favor and 419 against; there were 44 abstentions.

Report on Vote on Program

LD1912110289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] [Announcer] As usual during the days that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies is working, we shall begin our program with a direct relay from our correspondents' unit in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Our duty correspondent for today, Vladimir Korablev, should be at the microphone. Hello, Vladimir, you are on the air and we are listening.

[Korablev] Hello. I shall remind our listeners that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev opened this morning's session of the congress. He appealed to the congress' Editorial Commission working on remarks and proposals on the draft law on amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution on issues of the electoral system to start work at once in the Hall of Mirrors so that the congress can hear its conclusions before the morning is over. Then the floor was given to Comrade Slyunkov, chairman of the commission which is summing up proposals on the government's report on measures for economic recovery, stages of the economic reform, and principled approaches to the elaboration of the 13th 5-year plan. Comrade Slyunkov recalled that more than 160 deputies have spoken on the issue under discussion at meetings of congress groups and at its plenary sessions. Furthermore, more than 300 deputies have conveyed their proposals to the editorial commission.

But quite stormy discussions developed again today on many points during the adoption of the draft decision. Taking part were more than 20 People's Deputies and another 50 people have registered. A number of deputies came out in favor of supporting and adopting the government's program; others said that it could only be taken congnizance of. After the debates had been brought to an end, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, spoke. He said the congress should express its clear position on the program; either it is supported by the People's Deputies or it is only taken congnizance of.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev submitted three proposals for discussion by deputies. The first proposal concerns adopting and supporting the government's program; the second is that it should only be taken cognizance of. However, there was also a proposal by Deputy Andreyev who, in his speech, expressed no confidence in the government and suggested that a fresh report be compiled on measures for economic recovery and also that those members of the government who have not coped with their obligations to bring our economy out of its crisis situation should retire. When a name vote was called most People's Deputies voted to support the government's program. On the second proposal, to take cognizance of the government program, only 389 deputies voted for and 1,532 voted against. Deputy Andreyev's proposal was also rejected. So the government's program on measures for economic recovery has been approved by the majority of People's Deputies and the first, expanded variant of the draft decision has been adopted. The congress is continuing and at this point I end my report from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Medvedev Denies Politburo Intention To Resign

PM1912114389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by unnamed correspondent of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting 18 December 1989 at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses: "V.A. Medvedev. On the Congress Debate and the December Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave an interview to a correspondent of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting 18 December.

Appraising the debate which has developed at the Congress of People's Deputies, he said:

[Medvedev] In my opinion, the debate now going on at the congress indicates that the process of the establishment of Soviet parliamentarianism is advancing, even though its progress is quite complex. I think that deputies have adopted a more businesslike attitude toward debate, there is less desire to get hold of the microphone at all costs and more concern for the end results of the work. There was also a meaningful debate on the government program for the economy's normalization. I think that at times there was an excessive emotional element here, a desire to give a political overtone to any other view of an issue and to exploit differences in the perception of various questions so as to emphasize some sort of special positions and even the nonacceptance of the government program. I believe that this is not in the interests of the cause. Especially since, on the whole, the majority of proposals made by deputies who argued that the government program was unacceptable are not fundamentally at variance with it and could be the topic of a general debate.

[Correspondent] Taking advantage of this occasion, I would like to ask you the following question: Many foreign news media, including REUTER, carry reports that the last plenum of our party Central Committee revealed that there is no unanimity of view in the Politburo and that the Politburo in general is almost ready to resign?

[Medvedev] Yes, I am familiar with this kind of reporting citing statements by individual plenum participants. I cannot answer for these statements—that is up to their authors. I would like to say just one thing: Reports that the Politburo allegedly intended to resign or that demands for the Politburo's resignation were made by Central Committee members and plenum participants do not correspond with reality. There was an episode involving the speech by one plenum participant in which it was asserted that the West is praising us very strongly for perestroyka, that even the Pope gave it his blessing. In reply to this groundless and incorrect statement Comrade Gorbachev remarked that this kind of statement means nothing other than criticism of the course presently pursued by the party leadership, a leadership which allegedly proceeds not from the interests of our people and our country but panders to the interests of the West as it were. If this were really so, Comrade Gorbachev said, the Politburo would likely have to resign. Comrade Gorbachev called on plenum participants to give their views on this score. Subsequent speakers responded to this episode. Even though the debate was sharp and critical, also from the viewpoint of appraising the work of the Politburo and our party's leadership, it ended as a whole with the unanimous adoption of a resolution on the first question, with all Central Committee members without exception voting unanimously for it. There was approval of those conclusions and appraisals in Comrade Gorbachev's speech concerning the question under discussion. Support was expressed for the basic provisions of Comrade Ryzhkov's report, and it was decided to convene an enlarged party Central Committee plenum in January 1990. Thus, there was no submission of the Politburo's resignation, let alone any demand for the Politburo's resignation by plenum participants. I can declare this most definitely.

[Correspondent] Many deputies here at the congress are now saying that it would probably be quite a good thing to publish a stenographic account or expanded report on the Central Committee plenum. What do you think about this?

[Medvedev] In principle, the publication of plenum materials and stenographic accounts is something desirable. Especially in view of the party's role in our society. And such material is being published, as it applies to Central Committee plenums and conferences held at the Central Committee. But decisions to this effect are made by the plenum itself. On this occasion the question of publishing a stenographic account was not raised at the meeting of the Central Committee plenum.

Further Speeches at 13 Dec Congressional Session

Popov Scores Central Control

PM1812124589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Deputy G.Kh. Popov from the Union of USSR Scientific and Engineering Societies (chief editor of VOPROSY EKONOMII) at 13 December evening sitting of Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Comrade deputies! The success of the work of our congress has tremendous importance for the entire process of the establishment of the soviet system in our state. If our congress demonstrates insufficiently effective work, that will unfailingly also affect the elections to the republic and local soviets. Ineffective work by the congress will mean a loss of faith in the congresses of deputies. That is why we are faced with an enormous task—ensuring its effective work.

In the past, at the first congress, I said that every people's deputy was literally inundated with complaints from voters. Some 6 months have elapsed but the flow of complaints is not abating. We are trying to do something but I am sure that both you and I have a growing sense of our own impotence. And this impotence of ours is the most tangible proof that we are still living in a system of administrative socialism with its indifference to the fate of the ordinary man. For several months now I have been observing how, of the miners' dozens of demands, everything you like is being adopted for implementation except the main thing. And the main thing is the miners' demand to become the masters of their mine, to sell freely on the market everything they produce over and above the state order. It is the satisfaction of this sole demand which would calm the mine. But at the same time the unreadiness to accept this demand is obviouis. And that is proof once again that there have been no fundamental changes in the economic system.

When I hear about enterprises raising prices, about the disappearnace of cheap goods, about the lack of washing powder, about crammed trade bases and empty shelves, then for me that is the main proof that we are living under the old system.

Here, on this rostrum, after Nikolay Ivanovich's report, I have been hearing speeches with particular requests addressed to him. So far these requests come from the territories, but you may be sure that in a while requests from various sectors will start. For me that is also proof that we are still living in a system where the only method of obtaining resources is to organize a "campaign" on the central government and preferably from a higher rostrum. Of course, in a really new system the Uzbek unemployed (they number 1 million), given their ability to work, would long ago each have received 10-20 percent of a hectare and would have flooded the country with fruit, sparing it the need to import.

In a market economy it is not only expensive goods but also, as is well known, the cheapest goods which are produced only if there is a good return on every ruble of sales. In the market economy the seller does not sweep his store bare for the sake of reserve stocks. On the contrary, he tries to get everything from the stockroom into the store more rapidly. No one ever dismisses an able engineer from a market-oriented enterprise, however refractory he may be. In a market economy an apartment is bought with money earned at the workplace, people do not haunt the thresholds of countless bureaucratic offices. In a market economy it is group egoism, about which so much is being said now, which moves development, because it has a powerful restrictor in the form of competition.

All our troubles—economic, social, and ecological—stem from the fact that the dismantling of the system of administrative socialism has not yet taken its main steps. Yet the country, the situation in the country, is changing and changing very rapidly. Before our eyes the volume of shortcomings in the administrative system has exceeded its critical mass and, to use the words of the esteemed Velikhov and Sagdeyev, a chain reaction of disintegration has begun. It has its own laws, this reaction. I do not know what the next shortage will be. It will probably not be soap. But I am sure there will unfailingly be a shortage in this system. It cannot be otherwise.

The disintegration of the economic system leads to the deterioration of the position of all working people, especially workers with set wages—from librarians to officers. The lives of hundreds of thousands of pensioners are difficult even to imagine. At the same time the leaders' privileges are maintained and a surprising attempt has been made to begin to resolve our country's problems by increasing the wages of the party organs' apparatus and the ministry officials.

It is in the light of this situation that we should approach the government report we are discussing. This report consists as it were of four units—a scheme for the future, approaches to the 13th 5-Year Plan, transitional stages, and urgent measures. Unfortunately the item has no breakdown of the plan and budget for the forthcoming year of 1990, which would be an important link for understanding the overall picture. But I hope the congress will hear Deputy Filshin from the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, who will analyze the 1990 situation for us.

First about the end scheme. It has not been allotted to a separate section. What comes through the text of the report does of course generate approval. But nonetheless life itself already demands that the people be told what kind of an economy and what kind of socialism we will leave our children in the forthcoming 21st Century. In the light of our insufficient resolve in providing a model of the future, it was with special interest that I turned to the item on the 13th 5-Year Plan and sensed something very familiar. I returned to my shelves and got down four documents: One was the present report of our government, the second the same government's report at the 27th CPSU Congress in 1986, the third the report of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers at the 26th congress in 1981, and finally, the fourth was the report of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 22d congress in 1961. All four documents constantly discuss one and the same thing—steel, meat, housing, milk, bread, and so forth. That no one should accuse me of any prejudice, I shall take something in relatively good shape in our country—eggs. In our government report, page 34, I read: Per capita production of eggs in 1985 totaled 260, in 1990 it will total 280, and in 1995—285. I take the speech made at the 27th Congress: The plan for 1990 is 80 billion eggs. Then I look at the speech of Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov at the 26th Congress: I learn that in 1976-1980 average annual egg production totaled 63 billion eggs, and that it was planned to produce 72 billion annually during 1981-1985. Under Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev it was 27 billion in 1960, 41 billion in 1970, and for 1980 110 billion were promised. If you are thinking that I am trying to catch out the authors on the discrepancies between their promises and the actual results, you are deeply mistaken. I do not even intend to ask elementary logic questions on the lines of the formula X+1. But if there has been a chronic nonfulfillment of promises, what guarantee is there that the next promise will be met? The point is that we have done and finished with this kind of rudimentary criticism of the economy long ago. More fundamental thinking is needed today.

The problem does not lie in figures but in the ideas behind them. The 13th 5-Year Plan is viewed in the government report in the same spirit as all the measures during all the previous 5-year plans. The apparatus has only made one concession to perestroyka—the size of the funds which it is prepared to allocate to public consumption. The government report contains mutually exclusive approaches. On the one hand there is the demand to adopt urgent rigorous administrative measures for the sake of the promised market. But the market as such is only a promise. While in practice there are the familiar indicators—the "millions of tonnes" and "billions of items." The entire approach to the compilation of the 13th 5-Year Plan is based on the right of the center to define the prospects of the country's life as regards the number of eggs, the kilograms of potatoes, and square meters of housing. However, it was precisely this original idea of administrative socialism which lead our country into the impasse. It was this impasse that we resolved to overcome in the course of perestroyka. It is impossible to think about free and independant collective and state farms and peasants, and at the same time to draw up plans at the center for the per capita production of eggs. It is impossible to speak sincerely about leasing, and cooperatives, and the market, and at the same time consider in earnest what proportion of the accumulations will be channeled into group "A" and what proportion will go to group "B." It is impossible to speak of the independence of republics and local soviets and at the same time decide at the center how much money they should invest in housing construction. You can only have one of two things: either independence in the economy, the market, and competition (and then these calculations of the government are a purely theoretical operation), or the government must be answerable to us for these figures. I will never believe that the government will submit to any independence whatsoever on the part of enterprises in our economy. I believe that the approach to the 13th 5-Year Plan should be totally rejected by the congress as anti-perestroyka.

The 13th 5-Year Plan should be the 1st, rather than the 13th. The 1st 5-Year Plan where the economy is not controlled by the center but developed independently by republics, regions, and enterprises. The 1st 5-Year Plan where the center will attend only to what remains under its jurisdiction. It should be the 1st 5-Year Plan of the elimination of bureaucratic centralism, the 1st 5-Year Plan of independence. Only in this case will it become the 1st 5-Year Plan of genuine economic growth in our history.

Now about the urgent measures. Many of them could be approved. They were elaborated by skilled economists headed by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin. For the first time the government has a specific plan. This is an enormous step forward. However, as a champion of perestroyka I must view with 10-fold caution the government's approach to the compilation of the plan for the 13th 5-year period, and especially the urgent measures.

Why am I concerned? First, because the proposed urgent measures represent a package of measures of central influence to be exerted from above. And second, because all kind of administrative bans and restrictions abound among them.

About the measures proposed from "above." I am convinced that a package of measures is needed to involve all who have a stake in perestroyka as full-fledged participants in it—that is the republics, local soviets, and enterprises. The past 5 years have shown that the concept of perestroyka from "above" does not work, that a new approach is needed. The center must be prepared not to rush in to save a drowning enterprise but to hand over the salvage operation to others who are nearer and who are no less interested in saving it than the center, that is, the republics and the local soviets. And above all to those very people who are drowning. Especially as our enterprises are often "drowning" not because they do not know how to swim but because the center binds them hand and foot, puts a millstone round their neck, and then offers advice on how to keep above water. The urgent measures are imbued with the idea: Keep still, don't hinder me while I get you to the shore. Then there will be a market. I very much fear that the center has bitten off more than it can chew. Has the time not come in the 5th year of transformations to depart from the concept of perestroyka from the center and adopt the concept of perestroyka by means of galvanization of all levels of the economy?

About bureaucratic administration. The system of urgent measures is divided into two stages. First, rigid bureaucratic administration, then freedom. But could it not happen that the "administrative narcosis" drags on for years, as has happened in the past, and the introduction of market operations is systematically postponed? After all, during the stage of urgent measures the market is not just not being created, it disappears altogether, it is merely a slogan-type promise.

We have been promised that the market will be introduced gradually. But the market is an objective economic mechanism in which everything is interconnected. It cannot be introduced gradually. It is impossible for the carburator to function while the starter is not working. For the motor to work, all its components must be functioning. There are no other options here. Do you get the idea?

In order to approve the urgent measures certain guarantees are needed to show that these measures are a bridge leading to the market, and not an attempt to preserve the past. Unfortunately, there are no such guarantees, and this is the crux of the matter. Serious measures have been proposed to us which could be approved if there were guarantees. Five laws providing the new foundations of the economy could serve as these guarantees. The laws on ownership, land, the enterprise, republics' economic independence, and local self-management. However, the USSR Supreme Soviet has not submitted these laws to us. In general I cannot claim that the members of the Supreme Soviet are trying to make life easy for themselves. On the contrary, they have spared no effort, they have not spared themselves, they have neglected their families. This is true. But it is also true that the Supreme Soviet has nonetheless not submitted to our congress draft decisions which we could have discussed here and which would give the go-ahead to genuine perestroyka.

We are working today just as we did 6 months ago, without discussing the draft laws on the structure of our union, land, ownership, and so forth. Moreover, the USSR Supreme Soviet has decided to submit these laws for nationwide discussion, clearly considering that the people are one thing, and people's deputies another.

All of us sitting in this hall are not considered mature enough to discuss these issues, the whole package of economic laws, prior to the nationwide discussion. If anyone was genuinely interested in the people's opinion it would be better to hold a regular referendum rather than a nationwide discussion. The republic elections provided an excellent opportunity for this. All that needed to be done was to add a number of referendum questionnaires to the ballot papers and use the same commissions to tot up the answers. But when a nationwide discussion is used to study people's opinion with the help of newspapers, journals, and television, you get the impression that this is an attempt to foist an opinion on us, something with which we are familiar from the past: It is either a matter of trying to put off a decision, or presenting deputies with the popular opinion that has been generalized by somebody somewhere.

While insisting that the package of economic draft laws should be discussed at the congress, we do, of course, understand that the congress is not the place where these laws should be adopted. However, we believe that the discussion of these draft laws at the congress would do no harm. That at worst and at best it would provide us with the opportunity, without adopting the laws themselves, to abolish right now, in December, those articles of the USSR Constitution which are at variance with the objectives of the reform.

It is, nonetheless, necessary to tell the people the truth. The congress has decided to postpone the main changes for at least a year. This is a fact which cannot be ignored. And it is up to the people to decide how they will live in the future.

We have discussed the situation which has taken shape at a session of the Interregional Deputies' Group and we have taken an important decision: to depart from the principle of the immediate introduction of the free market. That same option put forward in the government report. And we put forward the idea of a new option for changes: We accept the administrative measures, but in combination with the immediate introduction of the market.

I will explain the essence of the proposed scheme by the following example: A family is allocated an apartment and establishes examplary order. Their child is told all day long: You must not, don't touch, sit, don't run about, and so forth. When and where is this child supposed to grow? Another family in a similar apartment gives their child a corner of its own, there he can sit or stand on his head if he likes. It is not difficult to see which child is better off.

Our urgent measures remind me of the first apartment where there are many strict rules and it is not at all obvious where the market is suddenly supposed to come from. We are proposing to follow the example of the second family. It is not necessary to administratively regulate the whole of the economy but only that part of it which concerns the population's life—introducing ration cards to ensure a consumption minimum for every citizen at current prices. This minimum should be assured by means of a state order. Everything that is produced over and above can go to the free market.

Nikolay Ivanovich cited important arguments against ration cards and other measures here. Yet the country has been living for a long time on coupons—the worst kind of rationing—totally unprotected against the arbitrariness of those who issue and print these coupons.

It has been said here that it is impossible to implement a monetary reform, but the question of a monetary reform has long ceased to be an economic question, it is a political question now, and it must be implemented. People have spoken here about the convertible ruble and about the complexity of this problem. There are very many difficulties. However, if we liberate the peasant, and he frees the country from food imports, we will have saved that $10 billion which will become the first buttress of convertibility.

Speaking as an economist, comrades, I could end here, but as a deputy I cannot but draw attention to one more circumstance. It has been mentioned by Deputies Boldyrev, Stankevich, and others. What does the government expect from us in submitting its report? Is it just briefing us about its plans? Fine. It is necessary to take note of this information. However, if the government wants to make us approve these plans, we must raise resolute objections. We cannot follow the path of the Central Committee plenum which approved the government's plans. In general, the decision which has been adopted in this case is unclear: Either the Central Committee deemed it necessary to influence our attitude to the government report, or else it thought it necessary to become the coauthor of these plans. Everyone in our country must be answerable for his actions. If we approve the government plans now, we will change from being the legislature to being the executive. In the event the measures fail, it will not be the government which will have to resign but we, the people's deputies. We must say to the Council of Ministers: We have elected you, we have constitutional powers, and if your powers are not sufficient, ask, and we will give you what you need. But if you can—act on your own.

There is one more thing, I would like to say. What we need is an economic mechanism, a new, really new, economic mechanism. This is what I recently discovered in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic statistical report: During the first 9 months of 1987, 182 eggs were produced per hen, and during the first 9 months of 1989, 183 eggs were produced. Maybe the time has come to stop and think and grasp that in countries where there are enough eggs, no one decides at state level how many eggs each hen has to lay on average. Clearly, the time has come for some of our leading comrades to leave the hens in peace so that they can live with their rooster and provide us with sufficient quantities of eggs as a sign of gratitude for their independence.

Lithuania's Antanavichyus

PM1812134189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by Deputy K.A. Antanavichyus from Vilnyusskiy-Oktyabrskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic (sector chief of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Economics Institute), at 13 December evening sitting of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Highly esteemed chairman, esteemed fellow deputies. Today we must answer the vital questions of concern to each person. Will we be able to break free from the crisis in the economy? Have we really faced up to our economic problems? Have we realized that to overcome the economic defects and ensure our long-suffering people humane living conditions we can and must repudiate all prejudice and dogma, even if they are bound up with the names of Marx and Lenin? Even if for many years they had an attractive socialist ring. Have we grasped the fact that the pseudoreforms and innovations intended to divert the people's gaze, reforms designed to pacify the people with bright promises but which, however, essentially demoralize people and reduce them to despair invariably cause upheaval in this, one of the world's richest countries? Have we realized, finally, that the time for half-measures has passed? This is no longer the time for fine promises.

The dogmas which have accumulated over the past 70 years must be rectified today. Yes, the task facing us is incredibly complex: It is to recreate normal economic relations, revive the economically minded person, and restore people's confidence in the system.

Without confidence or man's interest, and initiative, all the measures designed to improve matters may come to naught, as has happened many times before. Thus, it is necessary to separate the economic reform from the reform of the political system. The priority, both in the economy and in politics, must be to break the monopoly. The protector of the monopoly in politics is the one-party system. The discussion on the deletion of Article 6 of the Constitution showed that the forces striving to preserve monopoly rights in politics are still strong. The protectors of the economic monopoly are the departments and ministries which operate virtually as the owners of social wealth. In V.I. Lenin's words, any monopoly leads to stagnation and decay. That is the point that we have reached. The party's political monopoly has led to a spiritual decay, the bureaucratic feudal state monopoly has led to economic decay. Consequently, the seriousness of our intentions is measured first of all by our attitude toward monopolies. Eliminating them is the prior condition for the restoration of democratic foundations both in politics and the economy.

Do the measures to improve the economy and our legislative activity provide an answer to that question? Yes, they do. Negative ones, unfortunately. The monopolies are still so strong that people don't dare touch them. The economic improvement measures paid much attention to the need to switch to market relations, but the overblown bureaucratic apparatus enthusiastically and subtly defends its monopoly interests and hinders the development of market relations. True, this document makes a modest mention of the fact that these processes, and I quote, "will lead to substantial changes in the functions and role of the sectoral ministries." The draft USSR Law on the General Principles of the Leadership of the Economy and the Social Sphere in the Union and Autonomous Republics enshrines the existing sectoral management on the basis of the principle of a democratic centralism which has already demonstrated its bankruptcy. At the same time it is asserted that all enterprises, associations, and organizations on a union republic's territory are under its control apart from those which are under the USSR's control. But all forms of production and spheres of activity of decisive importance for the functioning of the the country's economy may be placed under the USSR's control. Among other elements of state regulation the proposed measures envisage (and I quote): "...the planned regulation of the activity of enterprises which, within the framework of the existing legislation, fall within the sphere of direct state administration." Briefly, the basis of that selfsame centralized command administration is preserved. The history of reforms repeats itself.

As is well known, the basis of an economic system is the attitude to ownership. The time has come to openly state that universal socialization was a mistake. Yes, it was the fundamental feature of the so-called "socialist economy," but the latter has failed not only in our country and in East Europe but also in all countries of a socialist orientation. So let us finally say openly: All forms of ownership—state, collective, and private—have equal rights. On that basis let us prepare a program for the denationalization of agriculture, the social infrastructure, and, in part, industry. The priority, in addition to recreating individual farms in the country, must be to transform collective and state farms into joint-stock companies. Lithuania has experience of that.

Every worker must know what proportion of the common property belongs to him and must have the right to dispose of his share of it. In our opinion, the lease is totally unacceptable here. The only way is ownership. That will make it possible to recreate the sense of being the owner and, consequently, the master.

There should also be an immediate start on denationalizing the sphere of consumer services, local industry, and other services.

Ownership relations must be changed in industry, too. Joint-stock ownership and mixed state/joint-stock ownership must prevail over the present social ownership. The majority of workers must become owners. Therefore it will not be possible to limit ourselves to the sale of shares: Guided by the principles of social justice, it will be necessary to release and return a proportion of public property to its rightful owners. The predominance of shareholders is a significant feature of the democratic socialism which we have now begun to discuss.

Without a fundamental change in the attitude toward ownership we will not be able to avoid a command or feudal form of socialism. However, the proposed measures, like the USSR draft Law on Ownership in the USSR, do not clarify matters. The measures envisage a variety of forms, I quote: "...of social ownership, their equality of rights and competitiveness." That is, only of social ownership. But that already was the case. The USSR draft Law on Ownership in the USSR says that the USSR's socioeconomic system is based on a diversity of forms of socialist social ownership. What does this mean—"socialist social ownership." The world has never known anything of the kind. You cannot build the economy on such vague concepts. There must be clarity and certainty here, just as in the definition of the single object of union-republic ownership. I quote: The land, its resources, and so on are in union-republic ownership. But why? The Law on Land put it even "better": The land is in union-republic ownership and is granted for use only.

Do you see what is going on? The land no longer belongs to the Lithuanian people or the Russian people. They merely use it. I wonder how Russian land ceased to be Russian or how Lithuanian land ceased to be Lithuanian. Of course, we cannot accept such laws in principle. There must be absolute clarity here but, unfortunately, it is still lacking. What, for example, is the meaning of the following note: "Relying on the concept of socialism validated by Lenin in the final years of his life, it is possible to determine the bases of the new model of an economic system within the framework of the socialist choice."

In the first place, Lenin did not elaborate a concept of socialism at all but on the contrary noted in 1918: "We cannot provide a characterization of socialism: What socialism will be like when the finished forms have been achieved we do not know and cannot say." The bricks from which socialism will be built have still not been created. Our whole maidenly dread that we should observe the purity of socialism, however pathetic it may be, goes back to the Stalinist model. Unfortunately, time prevents me from quoting the many contradictions in the laws and measures.

Replying to questions raised at the beginning of my speech, I think that there is complete justification for saying that prejudice, dogma, and maybe the attempt to preserve the monopolistic preferences of the powers that be still prevail over the supreme economic and social problems. We still cannot make up our minds to radically change economic relations but try to make do with half-measures. The economic reform is being extended over many years but the administrative-command economy is fundamentally incompatible with the market economy. Therefore, the transitional period must be kept to a minimum. Figuratively speaking, we must quickly pass through the flame-filled corridor, otherwise we shall die. According to the measures proposed, the first stage of the economic reform will be completed in 1991-1992 and the second in 1993-1995. Such delay could prove fatal. By the way, the Baltic republics' sorry experience is an example of fatal delay in economic transformations. As early as fall 1988 we had formulated a concept for the fundamental reform of economic relations, the replacement of the command economy by the market economy, the granting of full economic independence to enterprises, farms, local soviets, cities, and rayons, the abolition of sectoral management, and the transfer of the country to horizontal links.

It took a whole year for the central organs to reach a positive decision on the question of the transfer of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to the new system of economic management, and that was so badly truncated there are doubts about the viability of this incomplete model.

You would think that, in our economic situation, if there are people who want to restore normal economic relations and revive the economy let them try, let them have a go. Especially if they cause their neighbors no harm or damage. No special subsidies are needed: If someone tries and succeeds, he will be an example to others. Others will soon follow and then we will all pull through. After all, there is no fairy tale in which all the animals leap out of the pit at the same time.

In continuing the idea of Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, I want to say this: Wouldn't it be fine to transform our society from one of people petitioning, pleading, and waiting (in the hope of a decision taken at the top) into a decisionmaking society, a providing, self-sufficient society in which each person can resolve his own problems. But are there not other, more political motives prevailing here? Experience shows that when politics prevails over the economy and over economic and social interests, then sooner or later it collapses. When one or other of your friends wants to try out his own method and seek his path independently, others shouldn't take umbrage or get in his way. After all, love is helping one another to reach the summit: First you, then me, one lending a hand to the other.

Alma-Ata's Nazarbayev on Balance of Power

PM1812142189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Speech by Deputy N.A. Nazarbayev from Alma-Atinskiy-Iliyskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Alma-Ata Oblast (first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee), at the 13 December evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed comrade people's deputies! During perestroyka, life compels us to seek and find the priorities and the main points on which to focus our efforts. Today the economy is the main link. I fully share Comrade Gorbachev's idea that perestroyka will conquer if it conquers economically. Consequently, the most important task now is to choose the optimum course of development that is radical enough but at the same time appropriate to current realities.

Voices are heard speaking out in favor of the immediate transition to a free market and distributive system throughout the country which could quickly restore balance to our economy. The advocates of this idea quote Lenin in this respect, saying that he urged us to learn from the capitalists with regard to production organization. That is true. Ilich did urge that we do this, but he was thinking of progressive rather than outmoded experience. We are being drawn backward, toward capitalism of the free competition era. This did exist, but at a quite different level of development of productive forces, and we know how it ended. Moreover, given our supermonopolies and shortages, this course of action would inevitably lead to the collapse of existing production ties and fantastic price increases.

I think that in this sense the third version of the concept proposed by the Soviet Government is the most acceptable. This is a well-considered document generating great respect. On the whole, it deserves approval. At last our government has taken a clear stand on prices, although at the March (1989) plenum we promised agricultural workers that we would introduce wholesale prices from January next year. Unfortunately, Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, who has my respect, and other scientists are not venturing to express their stance on the matter. However, we really must criticize some points in the government concept. At least with regard to the specific features of our republic.

At the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, if you remember, I strongly criticized administrative methods of controlling the correlation between growth in wages and growth in labor productivity. Some leaders of central departments took umbrage at my words, but there was no reason for this. After all, the influx of unearned money into circulation has not decreased—on the contrary, it has increased. Wages are an integral part of prime production costs. Surely it is wrong to confuse wages with profit and impose the same progressive taxation on them? Many directors of Kazakh enterprises who met in PRAVDA's "Business Club" aptly described this taxation as an imposition on wages. The main point is that our wages fund is still welded to the infamous gross output calculated in rubles. Hence the price rises and the undermining of the inexpensive range of goods. Hence also the increase in wages—not only while maintaining the previous level of real output but often with a drop in this level of output.

The 27th party congress determinedly exposed the secrets of fake economic growth rates and inflated efficiency. Four years have passed and what do we see? The intolerable gross commodity output is still "calling the tune." Decisions to use the national product indicator are being implemented formally. Surely this—let us be frank—anti-perestroyka situation is not going to persist into the 13th 5-Year Plan?

One of the postulates of economic reform is that enhancing production efficiency and improving the people's well-being is indissolubly connected with increasing regional independence and initiative. However, in the period between the First and Second Congresses of USSR People's Deputies, little has changed in this respect and the process of decentralizing management has come to a halt. In the Soviet Government report we only heard declarations on the need to give the republics greater rights. But the specific measures proposed will achieve the reverse: They will increase centralization. That is how we should interpret the proposition in the report on the center's licensing of output which can be taken into the foreign market. Without running the slightest risk of exaggeration I will say that this kind of approach is taken from the arsenal of the old edict methods and cannot be accepted. I will give you an example to back this up.

The mining and enriching combine in Aktyubinsk Oblast accounts for 95 percent of the chromium ore extracted in the Soviet Union. The transfer price of R27 per tonne has been established for the combine, while the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations sells 1 tonne of ore abroad for 100 foreign currency rubles, which, on the basis of the ruble's purchasing power, is worth at least 23 times more than the transfer price. And the difference is 16-fold for Balkhash copper. There are a considerable number of such examples. The USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations gives nothing of these currency profits to either the enterprise or the region. This is daylight robbery—there is no other word for it. By exploiting the right to issue licenses, this ministry is going to quash attempts by enterprises to enter the foreign economic arena in their own right—and it will do so on behalf of our congress. Is it fair to make republics dependent on the caprices of union departments? Today they deign to issue a license, but who knows what tomorrow holds? Any long-term agreement with partners will not tolerate this kind of voluntarism.

It has become usual to refer to our eastern regions as the country's raw material base. But take a look at the everyday lives of our miners, pit workers, and oil workers who create this base. Do any of the leaders in the central departments really consider the solution of social problems in the republics a priority? How can we explain to the people who have inherited a region so rich in resources from their ancestors why their standard of living is lower than in many other regions of the country?

In Kazakhstan we are developing our own concept of radical economic reform. It is based on new and, as it seems to us, fundamental foundations. Under this concept, the spread of different forms of ownership and market relations will be supported by the creation of the production structures and technological concerns most vital in market conditions. They will be formed from enterprises under various ministries and will create a stable framework for the economy, smash the diktat of the departments and the monopoly of the producer, and make it possible to eliminate producers' alienation from the results of their work in the conditions of large-scale industrial production. Despite resistance from the union ministries, their enterprises have begun to set up these concerns.

Within the framework of the proposed structure it will be most convenient to transfer to collective ownership and full autonomy for enterprises in determining output volumes and types of output and establishing ties between suppliers and consumers. And it will be more convenient for the state to regulate taxation. Our concept envisages creating centralized management of the development of productive forces rather than products, and it also aims to enhance the quality of the republic's technological complex.

This kind of approach resolves a cardinal problem of the socialist economy: It succeeds in combining the plan and economic accountability. In order to put these plans into practice, the republics need full economic independence within the framework of the federation, the right to ownership of their own territory, and guaranteed freedom in their relations with the center, departments, and foreign partners.

I would like to frankly point out that labor collectives are tired of having to beg for their own, earned resources from union departments and, believe me, if allowed to take matters into their own hands, they will be able to use these resources as they should be used. For example, we do not have the capability to process West Kazakhstan's vast oil and gas condensate reserves at local level. If we develop the region using our own resources, following the traditional scheme, we will not be able to resolve the task set before the 3d millennium. That is why we feel the question of forming a free economic zone in West Kazakhstan is now ripe. The same applies to the extremely rich Zharminskiy polymetallic deposits, which have been worked for 20 years now. No tangible results have been produced, however.

This approach is also relevant because, according to the concept proposed in the report, attention to developing base sectors is decreasing. We can appreciate this objectively necessary measure which aims to improve the lives of the people. However, we also realise that Kazakhstan's economy, where the concentration of base sectors is highest, will inevitably suffer because of this. In order to keep the republic's losses to a minimum, we must attract foreign capital—at least for processing the by-products which have accumulated and are worth many billions of rubles—and lower the state order to 70-80%. The remaining output must be left at the complete disposal of the collectives. This will make it possible to more rapidly resolve social problems at the local level.

Giving Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the right to independently manage their economies demands its logical continuation. If harmonization of economic relations in our country is to become reality, the provisions of this law must also be extended to all the other republics.

We can approve the provisions of the USSR Council of Ministers report if the USSR Supreme Soviet passes laws on ownership, land, taxation, and prices in the coming months. If there is no price review, what talk can there be of economic accountability, regional self-management, and lease relations in rural areas? Without this package of laws it is impossible to ensure broader commodity-money relations or the formation of mutually advantageous interrepublic ties, and it is impossible to create an effective market in the country and give land, factories, and plants a real owner.

Perestroyka is a serious test of organization and the ability to combine the country's regional and common interests. It requires big changes in the economic structure, which will take considerable resources. Consequently, perestroyka is a fairly costly undertaking. And what are we doing in this situation which is so difficult for the country? We are calling for strikes, voting against state laws, blatantly asserting collective egoism, and even sometimes provoking interethnic conflict.

All this is hitting perestroyka hard and depriving millions of ordinary people of the hope that it will succeed. Emotions often prevent us from seeing the truth and make the rational influence of the center more difficult where the situation requires this influence. Discipline has weakened in the country, and this has been aided to a considerable extent by the not always sound choice of director.

People's deputies who have visited Western countries have seen for themselves that democracy there is exercised strictly within the bounds of the law. State leaders are invested with the power to take immediate action when this is dictated by the interests of the people and the state. USSR people's deputies should give some thought to this. If we want to overcome our isolation, see our country become part of the world economic system, and eliminate union departments' conservative attitude to the republics, we must radically change the practice of allocating everything from the center and invest republic sovereignty with practical meaning.

Women's Committee's Dedeneva

PM1812112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Deputy N.N. Dedeneva (representing the women's councils united in the Committee of Soviet Women) at the 13 December evening session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Excerpt] Esteemed people's deputies! I am an ordinary textile worker and I have worked at the same enterprise for 25 years. I participated in the First Congress of People's Deputies and listened carefully to every speech. I paid special attention to the speeches by our scientists in order to get a great many things clear in my mind. I am forever contemplating our reality, indeed my girl friends at work often ask me questions. I get these depressing thoughts, thoughts that our celebrated scientists very often come out with unrealistic proposals. They are bogged down in endless arguments. It is usually the same ones who speak, but things get worse and worse. It is time to concentrate on one specific program, implement it, and think about the future.

The economy has a particular effect on women. Scarce goods are getting scarcer and more and more expensive, while we just talk louder and louder about perestroyka, to which the workers' reaction is: But what are we restructuring, what have we achieved? Indeed, there are no visible results. In fact, the pace gets slower and slower and the indicators are not improving. In the meantime crime is increasing dramatically, which is a particular worry. And the women of Siberia, on whose behalf I am speaking here, are making a just demand: Isn't it time to stop telling everyone that the stagnation period and anyone else you like—but not us—are to blame for it all and to get down to business?

Many people lived and worked honestly and conscientiously during the notorious stagnation period. Now people are trying to accuse them all and, at the same time, exonerate themselves of all responsibility for the mess the state is in: empty stores, endless, undignified lines, fear of going out at night because of the increase in crime. The upshot is that the people are already beginning to lose faith in perestroyka, since the problems have merely increased and it is taking too long to overcome them.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have listened closely to your speeches at home and abroad. But why is there a discrepancy between words and deeds? Perestroyka is complex and difficult. We know that. But at the very beginning you said that everything would be in place within 2 years; now you no longer name a date. I am very worried that our generation and, even worse, young people have lost faith in everything that is happening in the country. What has become of our competition, when we used to fight for every meter of cloth and kilogram of yarn... There were Stakhanovites—the Vinogradova sisters, and we grew up following Matrosov's example. Now a thick black line has been drawn through all this. In schools they have stopped using textbooks in the study of history, they teach using newspapers. What kind of people are we bringing up? Children are beginning to despise our past, they have wrong opinions about it. When we talk to them about our work and about our aspirations, they do not believe us, they say it is untrue. And if they ask us when life is going to get better, we do not know what to say. Where has it all gone? And yet we still have a well-developed agroindustrial complex in Omsk and its oblast. But a great deal of meat, milk, and other products leaves the oblast. We, the oblast, that is, are left with nothing. Why don't the other regions with a developed agriculture work like that? Our association, for example, produces industrial fabrics which are used by the national economy, in the manufacture of tires. Our work gets better every year and our products are in demand. What the enterprises of the meat and dairy and canning and processing sectors produce we do not know, because the shelves are empty. I cannot say where a Siberian can buy furs, warm boots, and warm clothing at reasonable prices. This season the "Bolshevichka" garment association is supplying trade outlets with winter overcoats without fur collars. But if they had these collars the price would be R600-700. And where would an ordinary worker find that kind of money?

We have adopted a great many laws, but they have not worked. The government must monitor the laws and take the responsibility for their implementation.

There is much to criticize. We hold rallies, demonstrations, and strikes, but the majority of people not only do not support us but are angry that the country is so disorganized. Indeed, the strikes have given us absolutely nothing, in fact the losses from the strikes are having to be made up by other people and the strikers have to be fed—also at someone else's expense. We must accelerate the process of finding effective, concrete measures and we must enhance and strengthen labor discipline.

Drunkenness, crime, and parasitism are on the increase among young people. How painful it is to read in the newspapers (it is shown on the television too) that freight cars are not being unloaded, that stations are overflowing with goods, and grain, vegetables, and other valuable products, bought abroad for foreign currency are being lost.

Comrades, how can it happen! After all, it is money earned by our labor. We simply do not understand how this can be allowed in our socialist state, with goods so scarce. Our anger knows no bounds. What kind of managers are we anyway!

We must put our multinational and multimillion-strong home in order immediately and establish strict liability and a high level of responsibility in tackling all matters and in all activities. I say this on behalf of all ordinary working women in Siberia. [passage omitted]

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov

*PM1812144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 3-4*

[Speech by Deputy A.N. Mutalibov from Kubatlinskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic (chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers), at the 13 December evening session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Perestroyka in the economy is going through tremendous difficulties largely caused by the fact that, having destroyed the old management mechanism, we have not yet created a new one. But not only this. We also see how strong those who openly struggle against perestroyka still are. Complexities arise in the course of it, which require constant analysis. We cannot, nor do we have the right to, merely refer to the mistakes made and write off all problems just by acknowledging them. We are firmly confident that it is now necessary, perhaps more than ever, to strengthen state order and discipline. For everything that we are doing within the framework of democratization has one aim: to enhance the Soviet people's well-being. Meanwhile, the country is being rocked by strikes, although it is clear that economic problems are not resolved with their help. Total license has given rise to the dangerous syndrome of indecision in society. Unfortunately, we have recently been speaking a great deal about the need to enhance discipline and order everywhere, yet we are not carrying this out in practice. While seeking to build a rule-of-law state, at the same time we have ceased reckoning with the existing laws by which society lives today. All this has a direct bearing on the program for improving the country's economy submitted by the government and being discussed at the present congress.

It is clear to everyone that the program will not work in itself unless we examine the package of measures that are needed to create the appropriate conditions.

It is probably necessary to make amendments to the package of documents adopted over the past 2 years within the framework of the economic reform. I have in mind the impracticable idea of the state order, which was, of course, unable to work as envisaged under conditions of an economy suffering from shortages. As you know, the associated idea of creating a market for means of production and material resources and establishing direct ties under conditions of monopoly economic management was not implemented. We must recognize that the said innovations hit hard at the integration processes and had an adverse effect on the all-union division of labor. The adoption of the laws on labor collectives and the state enterprise under conditions of imperfect normative acts gave rise to group egotism and led to an appreciable drop in production of real output. The fact that the choice of enterprise and association leaders, which collectives exercised, sharply reduced the exactingness of the former toward their subordinates also played an adverse role.

Proceeding from the aforesaid, I wish to say that the government program for improving the economy is probably the first one in recent years to objectively reflect the situation which has taken shape. Its realization is a matter for each and every one, regardless of the place he occupies in society.

While supporting the main points of the report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, I would like to express a number of views. We need, above all, to normalize monetary circulation. The program provides for a way to sharply increase production of consumer goods and the rendering of services to the population. It is possible that the capacities for such a sharp increase in the production of goods do exist in the country, but the question of resources arises: For a great deal has to be imported even now. However, a further increase in purchases of imports runs counter to the idea of stabilizing the country's currency stocks. What is to be done here? We also need, in addition, to acquire both advanced technology and equipment. Currency is needed for such purposes too. To wait until Soviet industry assimilates everything that now has to be purchased abroad would mean wrecking the program at the very first stage.

The normalization of monetary circulation within the framework of the republics does not require the overall balancing of the volume of commodity resources with the commodity turnover plan but observance of the structures of the resources sold to the population. I will decipher this assertion, using specific examples. We have a great need for technically complex goods: television sets, radio-cassette players, household electrical appliances, and cars, for which the population has the money set aside in banks. Is it possible to reckon that a fivefold increase in vegetable sales, let us say, will enable this money to be taken out of the banks? Of course not.

The planning of growth in consumer goods production without correlation with the specific commodity mass normed per person will not ensure a reduction in emissions either. I wish to take this opportunity to report that we are taking specific measures, and emission in the republic has been reduced by 45 percent. But in the country as a whole it has increased more than 30 percent. We consider it necessary to take this into account and to give republics the right to independently distribute the planned volume of emissions within the annual volume.

I wish to draw attention to the fact that individual points in the program contain elements of a departmental approach and fail to take account of special features in the republics' development. Thus, the procedure for the centralized fixing of the prices of basic raw materials and fuel and energy resources is retained in 1991-1992. Equivalency of the exchange of products under conditions of regional economic accountability requires the fixing of prices which objectively reflect socially necessary expenditure, taking local special features into account. For our republic it is a question, above all, of the prices for oil, cotton, and other types of output. The republics should be given more rights on this question too. Rigid departmental use of the republic's natural resources has created a serious imbalance in the structure of production, which is now oriented more to meeting the needs of the all-union market regardless of our own needs. At the same time the current policy of self-sufficiency makes me ask a natural question: With what can the republic implement it? Does this mean that we must pose the question of reducing the state order for the most important output produced within the framework of the all-union division of labor?

The unfavorable social conditions under which the republic's population finds itself demand an answer to these questions. We believe that the republic must have real rights to use free resources for conducting foreign economic relations. This will make it possible, if not to resolve social problems, at least to alleviate them more quickly.

The draft under discussion clearly reveals the policy of further centralizing measures to regulate the economy, the prices policy, the unified taxation system, and monetary circulation. And yet the republics are to embark on the path of economic independence in 1 year's time. From this viewpoint it is expedient to view the coming year as a transitional stage to economic independence. Hence the need to gradually commission levers of republican self-management. In our view, it is not expedient to separate measures to improve the economy from those envisaged in the concept of the republic's economic independence, bearing in mind that this path alone is the most constructive means of extricating the economy from the crisis and shaping a genuine balance of interests on a countrywide scale. Excessive caution in transferring the functions of managing processes which can be resolved locally without detriment to the country's economy creates tension in relations between the center and the republics and eliminates hope in the possibility of rapid changes in this sector. A specific example. The question of setting up in the republic just a branch of the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity [Vneshekonombank], and with a status analogous to that of branches set up in certain republics, has been pending for approximately 1 year. What is the explanation for such an attitude toward the republic on the part of the Vneshekonombank leadership?

It is necessary to take a more profound and differentiated approach to drawing up measures concerning the utilization of the existing mobile labor resources in the republic, which, as is known, constitute the basis of the country's productive forces. At the First Congress of People's Deputies we posed these questions acutely, and there was talk, in particular, of the need to continue the construction of Kirovabad Motor Vehicle Plant and Baku School National Computers Plant but, unfortunately, this has not been reflected in next year's plans.

The problem of finding jobs for people is still further complicated by the presence of refugees. There are now 205,000 of them in the republic. To tell the truth, we have been left on our own in this complex situation. The Azerbaijan people have always come to the aid of other peoples. Are we not involved in the construction of Slavutich, having responded to the disaster which befell the fraternal Ukrainian people? Azerbaijan construction workers are today helping to open up the Non-Chernozem Zone and to release Siberia's oil, constructing the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad, and working in the Far East. But now misfortune has come to our house, and we have a right to count on assistance. A special government program is needed. We have requested this many times. Tens of thousands of refugees are waiting for housing and work and, becoming embittered, they sometimes undertake illegal acts. As a result of this, and also as a consequence of Armenia's continuing overt interference in the republic's affairs, a dangerously explosive situation has taken shape here. The protracted conflict around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], the reluctance of destructive forces to normalize the situation—all this is provoking a wave of rallies and strikes and detracting from the resolution of urgent problems.

The situation that has arisen is being utilized skillfully by anti-perestroyka forces, corrupt circles, and criminals. Sometimes it seems that the actions of these forces are being directed from a single center. The deputies from Armenia who mounted the congress rostrum yesterday declared that they have resolved the question of the NKAO for themselves. On behalf of our delegation and the entire people of Azerbaijan I voice profound indignation at the resolution adopted by the Armenian Supreme Soviet on the annexation of the NKAO and, in addition, a number of other Azerbaijan population centers to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. This unconstitutional, unlawful step by the Armenian SSR was taken at a time when a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution defined measures to normalize the situation in the region and the Armenian SSR and Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviets were entrusted with taking all measures to normalize relations between the two peoples, to restore an atmosphere of trust and cooperation, and to arrange normal economic and cultural ties.

It is clear that the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet decision does not have juridical force and, in our profound conviction, does not reflect the opinion of the Armenian people either. Unfortunately, the said decision was one more factor contributing to increasingly frequent acts of sabotage and firing on Azerbaijan villages located in rayons contiguous with Armenia. Precisely these circumstances obliged us to ask the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to allocate an additional contingent of internal troops to step up protection for the population of the border rayons. We resolutely demand strict observance of the USSR Constitution. Exhaustive measures must be taken to end the neighboring republic's interference in our affairs.

On behalf of Azerbaijan's deputies I express support for the program submitted by the government and ask you too to support it.

Uzbekistan's Mirkasymov

PM1812105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 4-5

[Speech by Deputy M.M. Mirkasymov from Yangiyulskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Tashkent Oblast (chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers) at 13 December evening sitting of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Comrade Deputies! The draft report on key problems of economic reform which the government submitted to the congress was distributed in advance. This enabled people's deputies to thoroughly study the basic provisions with scientists, economists, economic workers, specialists, and the public. We believe that the proposed fundamental approaches are a serious basis for resolving urgent problems.

However, I must be frank and say that the outlined measures do not adequately take into consideration the regions' varying development levels and union republics' specific features and difficulties. Whereas the situation in the country's economy as a whole is bad, in Uzbekistan, for instance, it is much more serious. Despite a population of 20 million people, its population growth rate is three times the average union level. This means that if the country takes one step forward, we must take three. Not to outstrip it, but just to ensure that we do not lag behind any more on social development questions.

Could we have developed in this way given the country's existing attitude to outlying areas? Look, over the last 30 years we have been allocated half the average national level of per capita state capital investments for housing and sociocultural and consumer amenities. What is more, instead of normally constructing schools, hospitals, and kindergartens, ill-equipped buildings were handed over in bulk through force of circumstances for these purposes and are still included by the USSR State Planning Committee on the balance sheet.

That is why figures provide little evidence of our lag on social questions, you have to see this level for yourself in order to envisage concrete measures. Approximately 9 million people in the republic today have a per capita income of less than R75, which does not provide a living wage. One-fourth of the able-bodied population is not involved in the social production sphere and many questions of housing provision for people have not been resolved.

How did we find ourselves in this position? Why could we not provide our population with a fitting standard of living? One of the main reasons is that union organs' investment policy has hitherto failed to take into consideration the demographic situation which promoted the emergence of unemployment in the republic and the creation of serious social tension. Without waiting for union decisions on economic recovery, we are, to the best of our resources and capabilities, taking our own steps to keep our capacities loaded to the maximum, boost shift work, create small production units, and develop the sphere of homework.

In our view, one of the chief measures is the allocation of land for garden plots and individual housing construction. We have already decided to give peasants 250,000 hectares land, which is as much as our population has today. We realize the significance of housing, work, and the resolution of the food problem.

We are also seeking other ways. But we cannot resolve the situation in which the republic finds itself today on our own. That is why we expected to see practical steps to even out the various regions' starting conditions in the measures for the country's economic recovery.

Provision must be made without fail for targeted financing from the union budget which will enable backward republics to reach the mean union per capita social security indicator.

I believe that this is not only the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic's [SSR] opinion. We are examining urgent social development tasks that are indissolubly linked with the question of economic recovery and the deepening of economic reform. It is clear today that there is no alternative. At the same time some provisions of the report that has been submitted are at variance with the general principles for extending republics' sovereign rights and the draft Laws on Ownership and Local Self-Management.

The approach to problems of ownership is a central question of agricultural reform. We believe that production and scientific-technical potential, along with the land, its minerals, and other natural resources on the territory, must be the property of the republics. They must dispose of them independently, above all in the interests of their own people and also the peoples of the union. However, union departments in Uzbekistan are still mining minerals without coordination with the republic. There have been numerous cases of barbaric use of these minerals with pernicious consequences for the environment. Even mineral stocks are not limitless. We are firmly convinced that we can only set matters to rights in the economy, in resource-saving, and in the ecology by correctly resolving questions of ownership. We intend state ownership to hold the predominant position.

The unity of the national economic complex must be the main principle for relations between the republic and the center. We are convinced that maximum efficiency can only be achieved by consolidating all efforts and deepening direct, equal, and mutually beneficial economic ties between the republics and regions. We recently signed a cooperation agreement with Leningrad Oblast with a view to utilizing our regions' extensive potential. We are also establishing ties with Tyumen Oblast.

I believe that we must reinforce integration and cooperation instead of dividing up the country. Uzbekistan is rich enough in natural resources and produces gas, gold, and other precious metals, providing the country with a considerable amount of hard currency. We produce products with an unlimited world market. That is, cotton, silk, astrakhan, and other output. Everyone knows about our large range of fruit and vegetables. Our hardworking people are our most important asset. That is why the republic can act as a worthy partner in joint deals.

On questions of interrepublic deliveries I would like to draw your attention to the following fact. The government's proposed measures do not put all regions on an equal footing. The state order for cotton fiber, for instance, totals 100 percent in our republic—that is, the cotton is entirely distributed by union bodies. A desire to render the center strong is discernible here. But it will not be strong if the republics are weak and deprived of their rights. That is why we deem it necessary to set the state order for cotton fiber at the level of 70-75 percent of production and equate it to other types of agricultural produce produced in the country. Only with this approach are equivalent exchange and real economic equality possible between the republics.

In this connection I would like to talk about the reform of price formation. Inconsistency and delays in resolving this question arouse great disquiet in us. Thus, steps to improve the purchase price system have been mapped out only from 1991, and the level for cotton fiber is extremely low and unacceptable for us, moreover. Today, despite the fact that manpower expenditure on the production of a quintal of cotton greatly exceeds that on a quintal of grain, the difference in purchase prices is negligible. However, at present people in union bodies do not pay proper heed to our arguments. It is vitally important for us that suitable prices be set for cotton. They must fully reflect all expenditure on water, land reclamation, equipment, fertilizer, and also the funds required to provide normal social living conditions for the population. Without this it is simply impossible to transfer the republic to regional economic accountability. Moreover, the bulk of the profit obtained from the subsequent processing of cotton fiber still remains outside the republic, which accounts for the budget deficit. Lastly, people's negative attitude toward cotton cultivation is increasing.

We have once again submitted solid proposals to the union government regarding the formation of new prices, and we expect a positive decision. Otherwise we will raise the question of selling cotton at contract prices.

Comrade Deputies! The consistent solution of the problem of employment for the able-bodied population is of key significance for the Uzbek SSR during the elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan. We now have very real unemployment, only we refuse to call a spade a spade. The government has helped resolve a number of questions in the Fergana Valley, but we are only alleviating some of the strain in this way. What is to be done with other oblasts?

I would like to raise the following question once again from this high platform. Why have union departments not set about properly fulfilling the instructions given by the country's directive bodies regarding the elaboration of a concept for the economic and social development of the Central Asian region, which is in conditions of a sharp deterioration in the water supply, the provision of water, and the demographic situation?

It is quite obvious today that the use of manpower resources must be approached from broad, all-union positions. This is not only a problem for Uzbekistan and other Central Asian republics but also for the entire country. That is why we must draw up a targeted all-union employment program with the participation of union republics' central economic organs and scientific organizations.

It must define concrete measures to create conditions for real employment for the population and vocational training for cadres, particularly young workers and technical and engineering personnel from among the indigenous population. Because there can be no national and social progress without industrial development. For it is no secret that many of our troubles are the result of voluntarism in siting productive forces and inconsistency in the substantiation of territorial policy, which have given rise to distortions in the economic structure.

We can no longer tolerate the fact that raw materials and semimanufactures account for two-thirds of the republic's industrial output. Agricultural output is sold virtually unprocessed. Uzbekistan can no longer remain a raw material base—it must become a full economic partner in the family of union republics. We must break the union organs' attitude towards us as a supplier of raw materials.

In view of this, and also in view of the demographic situation, we insist on major measures to ensure the priority development and siting in Uzbekistan of labor-intensive and high-technology enterprises producing output with a high degree of finish.

In conclusion I would like to draw your attention to the fate of the Aral. The restoration of ecological equilibrium in the Aral area is an all-union problem. Paradoxical as this may seem, the country's attainment of self-sufficiency in cotton has become a tragedy for the sea and for the millions of people living on the vast territory adjacent to it. We must eliminate the consequences of this tragedy together. The party and government program of nature-protection measures and the improvement of the sanitary situation are only really feasible with targeted financing and material and technical supplies. A special union organization must be set up for this, acting as a single client to which all water resources and land reclamation construction in this region must be transferred.

The shortage of water resources in the republic is increasing to a catastrophic extent. That is why, along with the implementation of water-saving measures, we must continue the scientific study of questions linked with bringing water resources into Central Asia. Without that there is no prospect of the population's development and continued existence there.

I will end here. On behalf of the republic's people's deputies I propose that the report be approved as a whole. The measures it outlines deepen the processes of radical economic reform and reveal new opportunities for the development and strengthening of the economy. The government headed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has found the correct ways to approach the resolution of urgent tasks. That is the opinion of all Uzbekistan's deputies. I am convinced that the proposals and addenda voiced at the congress will enrich the program and that we will be able to find a way out of the crisis situation in the economy.

Abalkin Defends 'Modest' Economic Reform Plans

PM1812181189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

["Snap Interview" with L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by unnamed PRAVDA parliamentary correspondent, under the general heading "Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies": "L.I. Abalkin: 'No Illusions'"]

[Text] Yesterday the congress continued its discussion of the government's economic program. In the light of the results of the debate in the sections the deputies put forward a number of proposals and additions. This is the theme of an interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Commission on Economic Reform, by PRAVDA's parliamentary correspondent.

[Correspondent] Leonid Ivanovich, many people have said that you have become more restrained in your opinions now that you have moved to a government post.

[Abalkin] I would not associate my office with my views. Knowing the powerful inertia of economic processes, I have never had any particular illusions about getting the economy out of the crisis instantly, overnight. Many of the deputies who are economists, in putting forward counterproposals to the government program, remind me of designers faced with a blank sheet of paper: "We can draw whatever we like." Of course, it is easy to draw the ideal economic edifice on paper. But we have to negotiate the ravines! And it should not be forgotten that the situation in which the reform is developing is by no means ideally "clean"; it is inhibited by numerous shortages, on the one hand, and numerous surpluses, on the other. I am talking about the swollen channels of money circulation, cash and noncash, and the surplus of politicized ideas and emotions in the economy.

Many deputies see every government proposal as an example of perfidious "apparatus" intrigues. Some, for example, are demanding restrictions on the government's issuing functions. Otherwise, they say, it will start making up for its own omissions by issuing money in excess of the plan. It is worth recalling that at the second session the Council of Ministers itself insisted on a strict limit of R10 billion, whereas many deputies were inclined to tackle social problems by issuing money in excess of the plan.

[Correspondent] Some people are unhappy, saying that the government plans to lease out 20% of enterprises by the end of the 5-year plan, instead of 50 or 70%, are too modest.

[Abalkin] But what about pluralism of forms of ownership? Why should we artificially inhibit someone or push him into choosing a particular form? Indeed, we are going to be seeing joint-stock, collective, and cooperative enterprises developing as well. One should not forget about the state sector either. What do they mean, anyway, when they say "plans"? After all, many government analyses are in the nature of forecasts, in view of the widening economic independence of republics and territories.

[Correspondent] At the press conference you cited two figures together: a budget deficit of R120 billion, and enterprises' spare residual funds amounting to around R100 billion. Does this mean that the government is studying the possibility of confiscating this money from enterprises in an emergency?

[Abalkin] It is a great temptation to take such a step and thus solve many problems, balancing the noncash circulation sphere. But wouldn't we be undermining people's faith that everything they earn belongs to them? It has happened before in our history. And it has ended badly.

[Correwspondent] What is your opinion of the radical proposals on economic reform put forward at the congress?

[Abalkin] They must be analyzed. But I already have my doubts about the general tone of certain speeches, which are essentially suggesting an old, familiar path: solving all the problems at a stroke, by immediately plunging the economy into the abyss of the market, forgetting that you have to improve (forthwith!) the centralized system of state regulation. As for the ill-judged proposals on a rationing system and monetary reform, the government does not accept them. It has already expressed its view to the congress, reinforcing it with evidence based on rigorous expert analysis.

Members of Congress Editorial Panel Listed

PM1812115589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Editorial Commission of Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] Commission chairman: Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Commission members: Arkadiy Pavlovich Aydak, chairman of the "Leninskaya Iskra" Collective Farm, Yadrinskiy Rayon, Chuvash Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR].

Chingiz Aytmatov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of Historical Heritage Commission.

Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee.

Viktor Amazaspovich Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences.

Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers.

Andrey Ivanovich Vorobyev, director of the USSR Ministry of Health All-Union Hematological Scientific Center, Moscow City.

Daniil Aleksandrovich German (Granin), writer, secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board, Leningrad City.

Anatoliy Valeryanovich Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Givi Grigoryevich Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and first secretary of North Osetian CPSU Oblast Committee.

Dalgat Gadzhiyevich Zaynalkhanov, machine operator and docker at the Makhachkala Maritime Commercial Port, Dagestan ASSR.

Kliment Yegorovich Ivanov, member of the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Financial Commission.

Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Yuriy Khamzatovich Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee.

Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee.

Dzhangir Ali Abbas ogly Kerimov, faculty head at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

Aleksandr Ivanovich Konovalov, rector of Kazan State University, Tartar ASSR.

Zoya Petrovna Krylova, chief editor of RABOTNITSA magazine, Moscow City.

Vitautas Vitautovich Landsbergis, professor at the Lithuanian SSR State Conservatory.

Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Petr Kirillovich Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

Rafis Khamzeyevich Mansurov, drilling foreman at the Aznakayevo Drilling Administration, Tartar ASSR.

Viktor Mikhaylovich Minin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Youth Affairs Committee and machine shop chief at the Glebovskiy Poultry Farming Production Association, Moscow Oblast.

Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister.

Konstantin Vladimirovich Nechayev, Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk and Yuryevskiy, chairman of the Moscow Patriarchate's Publications Department.

Aleksandr Mitrofanovich Obolenskiy, design engineer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Kola Scientific Center's Polar Geophysical Institute, Apatity City, Murmansk Oblast.

Orazgul Mukhiyevna Orazmuradova, pediatrician at the Serakhskiy Rayon Central Hospital, Turkmen SSR.

Nikolay Dmitriyevich Pivovarov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of People's Deputies and Management and Self-Management Development Committee.

Boris Vasilyevich Prokopchuk, first deputy chairman of Tyumen Oblast Soviet Executive Committee and chairman of the oblast agricultural committee.

Murtaza Gubaydullovich Rakhimov, director of the Ufa Oil Refining Plant Named for the 22d CPSU Congress, Bashkir ASSR.

Valentina Ivanovna Semenko, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee.

Nikolay Nikitovich Slyunkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission.

Kulzada Tleubayevna Tileubayeva, senior shepherdess at Moyynkumskiy Rayon's "Aydarlinskiy" State Farm, Dzhambul Oblast, Kazakh SSR.

Ernst Petrovich Tikhonenkov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources Committee.

Klara Semenovich Khallik, member of the Soviet of Nationalities Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission.

Loik Sherali, poet and chief editor of SADOI SHARK magazine, Dushanbe City.

Viktor Ivanovich Shtepo, general director of Volgograd's "Volgo-Don" Specialized Production Association, Volgograd Oblast.

Lukyanov, Primakov, Nishanov on Congress

90UN0446A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Report of press conference devoted to preparations for Second Congress of Soviets recorded by S. Karkhanin: "Potential of Public Trust"]

[Text] Someone has calculated that in chairing sittings of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and sessions of the country's Supreme Soviet the following three persons have been on television for approximately 300 hours. And it is not surprising that it was to them that Soviet and foreign journalists addressed their questions at a press conference held on Tuesday [12 December] in Moscow devoted to the preparations for the Second Congress.

A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

The USSR Supreme Soviet Second Session ended 1 week ago. Its results convincingly confirm that, contrary to the opinion of certain skeptics, the USSR Supreme Soviet is justifying its purpose. Our parliament has shown that its creative potential is great enough.

Some 29 of the planned 34 items of the agenda were examined, as were also 20 questions "over and above the program" of importance to the life of the country and its legislation. Six bills were approved at first reading and published for nationwide discussion. But the laws will only begin to operate when our economy begins to function steadily, productivity increases and organizing work in the economy improves. After all, just two laws—on pensions and leave—"weigh" R44 billion.

We are receiving thousands of letters and telegrams from the electorate on each question discussed. These letters also contain dissatisfaction that some deputies are pulling the bedclothes over themselves, as they say, and engaging merely in self-publicity. Of course, we cannot take the path of legislative last-minute rush work and bake laws like blinys. It is clear, however, that we have potential for greater efficiency in the work of the Supreme Soviet and must use it.

As is known, it has mapped out for inclusion on the agenda of the upcoming congress nine items. It is intended holding the congress over a period of approximately 10 days.

We know that an appeal of six deputies on the question of the possibility of a 2-hour strike being staged on the eve of the congress was published abroad. We have spoken with these deputies and ascertained their position insofar as it is at variance with the Supreme Soviet's opinion in respect of strikes. This opinion was unambiguously expressed in the appeal of the Supreme Soviet and the decree on the prevention and undesirability of strikes in the fall-winter period in the base sectors of industry. So the Supreme Soviet itself answered the question of whether this "initiative" of the six deputies is desirable or undesirable.

Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union:

It is frequently asked whether a debate on Article 6 of the USSR Constitution is possible at the upcoming congress. As is known, this proposal failed at the session to accumulate the necessary majority, and thus a clause concerning Article 6 does not figure in the Supreme Soviet's recommendations pertaining to the congress' agenda. As far as Article 6 in general is concerned, we affirm the change in the party's role in the process of perestroyka and understand that the party's role is being modernized. But if a change in the article does occur, it should do so constitutionally, as in all civilized countries. A constitutional commission is at work; such questions are not, naturally, decided by a show of hands.

As far as the party's leading role is concerned, from our viewpoint its preservation is extremely necessary, particularly at the time of perestroyka. And it is not only a question of the party having begun perestroyka and not only of the party implementing it. The party is currently the sole force of our society consolidating the progressive movement in the renewal of socialism.

R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities:

The period since the last congress has shown that all 2,250 deputies are in fact participating on an equal basis in the discussion of this question or the other. The Supreme Soviet constantly furnishes them with the necessary information.

Preparing for the second congress, our representatives contacted foreign firms to improve vote-counting. We chose the Philips company, but, unfortunately, they had only 400 ready transportable machines, and we need a minimum of 800. We will have to make do with what this firm has. Electronics will help us speed up the counting process by a factor of five or six.

As far as interethnic relations are concerned, events are developing turbulently here. There was "double stagnation" here earlier. Ridding ourselves of its consequences will take time, of course. But I would say that the Supreme Soviet is in control of the situation and I believe that we will not in our law-making lag behind the turbulent processes in question.

Breakdown of Politburo Vote on Privileges Debate

PM1812171589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 p 1

[Unattributed answer to reader's letter under the rubric "Dialogue. Ask Questions": "How Did the Politburo Vote?"]

[Text] We can find out from your newspaper how All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] people's deputies vote on particular amendments, but can we find out how our party leadership votes—on the question of privileges, for example?
[Signed] A. Pavlov

From the bulletin of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies we can find out the results of the vote on the proposal to place on the agenda reports from the deputies' commission examining the privileges enjoyed by individual categories of citizens.

The people's deputies in the Politburo who voted "for" were: V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Ivashko, Ye.K. Ligachev, and A.N. Yakovlev. Those voting against putting this question on the agenda were: M.S. Gorbachev, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, and N.N. Slyunkov.

CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate members who voted "for" discussing this information were: A.V. Vlasov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, and G.P. Razumovskiy. A.I. Lukyanov voted "against."

Five CPSU Central Committee secretaries not in the Politburo voted "for": O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, G.I. Usmanov, and I.T. Frolov. Ye.S. Stroyev was absent from the session.

As you can see, this is total pluralism.

Moscow TV Relays 18 Dec Congressional Session

1300 GMT

LD1812143989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 18 December begins to broadcast a recorded relay of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies morning session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. A.I. Lukyanov chairs the session.

At 1300 GMT a bell rings and Lukyanov announces that the forum is convened. He announces the subject for discussion: changes and addenda to the USSR Constitution. Manayenkov is given the floor.

At 1301 GMT Manayenkov begins to speak. He says amendments have been proposed to 50 articles of the Constitution. Seventy-two deputies have suggested proposals which manayenkov's editorial commission has examined. The commission's document has been examined by those in attendance, and Article 95 is to be made more precise, he says. This relates to elections from the public organizations.

In continuing to expand republic independence, says Manayenkov, there is no need to have an established minimum age limit for elections. Such an age limit might limit the intake of fresh forces. Financial help from organizations and enterprise are conditioned by the Constitution: funds must not be controlled by candidates for elections but by an electoral commission.

Other draft laws on, for example, land and property are also in preparation, Manayenkov states. These may give rise to contradictions with the Constitution. Is a new one therefore necessary? This would be time-consuming. Amendments to the political and economic system are contained in the concluding part of the commission's report. Many proposals from deputies have not been entirely incorporated into the draft law as yet and further work can be done on these.

Manayenkov refers to a measure from Masaliyev on quotas of workers and peasants in the higher bodies of authority. Two deputies have asked for direct elections by the people of higher officials representing small ethnic groups. Some republics are experimenting with production-based elections. The commissions think such experiments are a good thing. The right to vote of people who are in prison been discussed—such people cannot vote. Those who are in remand, the commission feels, should not have the right to vote either. Some proposals are being handed over to the Constitutional commission.

1319 GMT

LD1812152989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1319 GMT continues its recorded relay of the 18 December morning session of the Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1319 GMT Lukyanov asks if it is time to vote, but there are more questions.

At 1320 GMT Deputy Shapovalenko asks a question relating to Article 95 on elections from the public organizations. Manayenkov has nothing to add to what he has already said.

At 1321 GMT a woman deputy asks about Article 96 and whether people under investigation but on whom no legal decision has been made can vote. Surely if so much effort is made to help a cosmonaut vote, at least someone who has not been declared guilty should not lose this basic human right. Manayenkov's response is that if someone is being detained, even though no verdict has been reached, that person cannot vote.

At 1323 GMT Lukyanov answers another question regarding electoral quotas. Lukyanov insists that 700 deputies from the public organizations are permitted in the USSR. Deputy (?Leonov) thanks Lukyanov for this representation on behalf of the public organizations.

At 1326 GMT Antanaitis of Lithuania says he feels that the wording relating to public organizations is too vague. Only the disabled have been specifically mentioned.

At 1328 GMT Engver says he feels that disabled deputies should not gain special treatment. They have been elected as ordinary deputies.

At 1329 GMTShelukhin asks why nothing has been said about his own plea for an addenda to Article 96. He lists those who are not able to vote and feels that there is an overlap in the articles dealing with this topic.

At 1331 GMTit is noted that Zaslavskiy's proposal has not won favor at the commission. His question relates to isolating the disabled within a public organization when in fact the vast majority do not belong to it. It is only when there is talk of abolishing public organization quotas that the disabled issue is brought up at all.

At 1333 GMT Lukyanov calls for debate of the matter. He is holding notes from various deputies calling for different formulations of Article 95. These vary in their support. Discussion is to follow the order of the articles in the draft law.

At 1335 GMT Burlatskiy complains that constitutional reform is being too hastily dispensed with since those who want to talk about it haven't had the floor. He says he has concrete proposals—for instance, proposals on human rights, on freedom of conscience, the press and the media, public associations, and the right to leave and enter the country. On Article 95, he calls for the decision of the Supreme Soviet to be retained. He says he would like to introduce an amendment to Article 100 on attaining a set number of votes as a qualifiaction for election—the number not necessarily to be the same throughout the country.

At 1342 GMT Yevtushenko speaks. He says he is dubious about Article 100 and its provision that any number of candidates, even if only one, can stand. He objects to the imposition of outside candidates on other areas in the hope of improving their chances of election. This infringes the rights of local people to elect their own choice of candidate. There should be no fewer than two candidates in any elections. He feels candidates would stand aside in favor of a nominee from the disabled associations.

At 1315 GMT Shapovalenko comes to the rostrum. He objects to the fact that not all members of public organizations vote in the elections for those who are to represent these organizations and cites women's organizations as a case in point. He stresses that ordinary candidates, workers or peasants, very rarely, if ever, stand unopposed.

1349 GMT

LD1812155389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1349 GMT on 18 December continues its recorded relay of the 18 December morning session of the Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1349 GMT another deputy at the rostrum remarks on the fact that the Soviets are proud of making their domestic laws coincide with international laws. Since, however, the suggestion of denying civil rights to a suspect in a legal case rejects the presumption of innocence, this cannot be the case. He calls for a vote on the day of mourning for Sakharov today and for the deputies to accompany the coffin, along with the many who have come from outside Moscow to do just that.

At 1353 GMT Klochkov comes to the rostrum to talk yet again about representation for the public organizations.

At 1355 GMT Sobchak claims a legal "nihilism" exists in the country's official bodies and seems to have penetrated the Congress. He points to confusion around the voting over Article 6 where people voted on others' behalf, for instance. He insists that the only way to solve the problems of the state is strict compliance with the law and that includes the laws relating to voting procedures.

At 1402 GMT Sobchak continues speaking.

At 1405 GMT Lukyanov intervenes on a procedural point. The session is to continue for another hour, then adjourn for the funeral of Sakharov.

At 1406 GMT Deputy Kim is told to take the floor. Lukyanov makes further remarks on adjournment procedure.

At 1408 GMT Deputy Kim makes a point about whether new norms for the election of deputies from public organizations should have a retrospective effect.

At 1410 GMT Deputy Dyadenko returns to the theme of invalids and the functions of public organizations. He supports the commission's version of Article 95 of the Constitution.

At 1414 GMT Deputy Boldyrev says that the current system of representation in congress for public organizations is not entirely democratic.

At 1420 GMT a deputy who represents the Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations lists some of their good work and contends that it is right that such organizations should have a platform so that they might be heard by the people. He concedes that there is some truth in the claims that the election of this section of the Congress was not entirely democratic, but supports the amendment proposed by the relevant commission.

At 1422 GMT Deputy Khmura suggests that the proposal to voted on article by article.

At 1425 GMT Deputy Stadnik proposes a formula to separate soviet membership from executive authority by excluding certain categories of officials from soviet membership.

At 1428 GMT Deputy Kazannik calls for a system of people's initiatives for the nomination of deputies, pointing out that there should be no alienation between the people and public organizations.

1432 GMT

LD1812162489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Televilsion Service in Russian at 1432 GMT continues its recorded relay of the 18 December session of the Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1432 GMT Deputy Zaslavskiy says the existence of the two separate electoral systems simultaneously is a destabilizing factor in the evolution of society. He feels that public organizations can be perfectly well represented through the constituency system. No country in the world, he says, has special parliamentary representation for public organizations.

At 1434 GMT Deputy Ryabchenko says that the representation of deputies from public organizations should remain valid until 1994 to avoid embarassment for sitting members. He suggests that Sakharov's seat should remain empty as a memorial.

At 1444 GMT Deputy Krayko says it is a violation of human rights that a minister cannot be elected a member of the Supreme Soviet.

At 1446 GMT Deputy Kirilov calls for a halt to political activity in the workplace. He says the people expect "moral satisfaction" from the current congress of people's deputies; this relates to the election of deputies from public organizations.

At 1450 GMT Deputy Alksnis says a relic from the era of Stalinism is that some people are still deprived of electoral rights; he claims this applies to one deputy from Estonia. This "violation of democracy" must be tackled.

At 1455 GMT Deputy Kuznetsov proposes an addition to the draft to forbid the financing of election campaigns from private funds.

At 1500 GMT Deputy Starovoytova reiterates the "offensive" nature of the representation of public organizations. If a candidate is a worthy one, he will win a seat in fair competition, she says. On Article 6 of the Constitution, she says that the CPSU should not allow itself to reach the state of sister parties in Prague, Berlin, and so on.

At 1505 GMT Deputy Boyars calls for the principles of equality, sovereignty, and self-determination to be introduced for all peoples of the USSR in line with internationally recognized human rights norms.

At 1510 GMT Lukyanov announces the adjournment of the session and changes in the sittings of certain commissions because of Sakharov's funeral. He says buses are waiting to transport the deputies. The congress iS to resume at 1600 Moscow time.

At 1530 GMT the session resumes. Lukyanov says there is no quarum for constitutional votes to be taken. He suggests that they could listen to the report on the draft law on status of deputies by Nishanov.

At 1531 GMT Nishanov takes the floor. He says that many individual and group proposals have been made on the draft law, all of which have been carefully studied. He lists the deputies who have put forward a draft which is still being published and will be handed out tomorrow. Another draft has put forward by Deputy Obolenskiy but it requires serious reworking. Some proposals run contrary to the general democratization in society.

At 1537 GMT Nishanov speaks of the need for a law of the whole country which would regulate relations between deputies and all different organizations and levels. He says it is vital to determine the status and rights of deputies in the law. The proposed draft aim to do this. Deputies have now moved into the forefront of political life but the attitue toward them has become far more exacting. The law should also stipulate the obligations of deputies, not just their rights.

1544 GMT

LD1812165189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1544 GMT continues its recorded relay of the 18 December session of the Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1544 GMT Nishanov continues speaking. He says the priority of interests which a deputy should bear in mind is also stipulated by the law. Equality of deputies at all levels is ensured. The combination of deputy work and other jobs is also taken into consideration. The draft law is aimed at stimulating deputies' initiative and getting them to freely express their opinions. The deputy's inquiry has been given a definition and regulated. Nishanov asserts that a deputy's main effort should be directed at fulfilling the mandate of his voters. There should be no obstacles to free speech. A deputy is a member of a collegiate body and not an individual with great power.

At 1550 Nishanov continues to describe the draft. It registers the rights and obligations of deputies and lists some of them. There are still officials impeding the work of deputies, he says. There is a new clause to deal with this. Proposals giving deputies rights of veto in other soviets are not acceptable. Nishanov expresses concern over the regular absence of certain deputies at the Supreme Soviet—this is just not good enough. He regrets to have to say that many deputies fail to inform of the reason of absence.

At 1556 Nishanov adds that the parliament has major contacts with foreign parliaments. However, it should be said that some of the trips abroad were made privately and during the work of the session. This is abnormal and the whole system of People's Deputies' foreign travel should be normalized.

At 1558 Nishanov says that only a small section of deputies regularly appear in the media, and that the number should be increased. All deputies should be given the opportunity to speak in the media. Nishanov cites an example of when a local newspaper failed to print a speech by the region's deputy.

At 1600 Nishanov moves on to the issue of mandates. It was seen as expedient to include the main clauses on mandates to be included in this draft. The draft also deals with providing deputies with assistance of various kinds, including freeing them from their professional obligations when necessary.

At 1604 Nishanov notes the drawing up of a separate draft law on the procedure for recalling a deputy. This should guarantee the rights of citizens but also protect deputies against groundless accusations. The rights of the electoral commissions have been extended in the draft. The central electoral commission is a permanent body unlike local commissions which have to be reelected in case of recall of a deputy.

At 1609 Lukyanov asks for questions to be handed in in writing and proposals to be given to the editorial commission. He suggests calling a halt and voting on constitutional amendments in the hope that there is now a quorum. Lukyanov says that deputies who failing to register their reason for absence should have their names published in the press to make them accountable for lack of discipline.

Lukyanov moves on to voting on law on amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution on election procedure. The relevant commission calls for the draft law to be adopted. Lukyanov warns against treading on the wires of the voting equipment. Apparently some deputies have lost their cards. Lukyanov calls for order. He calls for voting on amendment to Article 89 of the Constitution. 1831 for; 18 against; 26 abstentions; total 1875. Therefore, Article 89 is carried.

1614 GMT

LD1812182889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1614 GMT continues its recorded relay of the 18 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The deputies vote on a proposal on Part 2 of Article 90 of the Constitution—1,867 are in favor, 5 against, with 9 absentions; total votes—1,881. The proposal is adopted. The vote on an amendment to Article 91 folows: 1,808 for; 59 against; 15 abstentions; total—1,882. It is adopted.

Lukyanov then moves on to Article 95 and suggests dealing with it in parts due to its complexity. At 1630 GMT Lukyanov establishes that voting will be by name. He puts Part 1 of Article 95, on the establishment of secret ballots in electing deputies, to a vote: 1,740 vote for; 98 against, with 47 abstentions; total—1,885. It is adopted. On to Part 2 of same article, on elections from public organizations, Lukyanov explains the position of various forces on this question. Sobchak shouts something from the floor. Lukyanov asks him to sit down and tells Deputy Yemelyanov to hide his emotions in his pocket.

At 1641 GMT Neumyvakin speaks on the procedure. He believes that if this proposal is thrown out, public organizations will be left out in the cold. He puts to the vote the dropping of this part of article: 1,350 votes for; 510 against; 42 abstentions; total—1902. It is not adopted.

At 1647 Lukyanov says that two-thirds of all deputies have to vote for a change in the Constitution of the USSR.

At 1649 Deputy Bisers says the voting was conducted incorrectly, asking, since this part does not exist, then how could we vote on dropping a nonexistent part? Lukyanov reads out the relevant part to clarify the situation.

At 1655 GMT Lukyanov declares that the debates have ended while noise continues in the auditorium. Lukyanov points out that if this version is not adopted by the congress, the matter will have to be returned to commissions for further elaboration and the process will have to be repeated.

At 1656 Deputy Landsbergis says that, under the current circumstances, the first part of the article stands as adopted while the second is not.

At 1658 Deputy Yevtushenko voices no confidence in the commission; he says public trust in the Supreme Soviet is greater than in the commission.

At 1659 Lukyanov reads the section written by the commission allowing the election of ssome deputies from public organizations. he asks for a vote on this issue: 773 for; 1051 against; 64 abstentions; total 1,888. Lukyanov says that although the section has been rejected it stands provisionally.

Lukyanov then suggests that the editorial commission be instructed to consider the proposals that have been made. Further proposals should be submitted in writing, and the congress should move on.

At 1707 GMT Lukyanov suggests a break for 20 minutes to allow passions on the issue to cool down.

1710 GMT

LD1812181189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1710 GMT resumes its recorded relay of the 18 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Lukyanov says that the Presidium has discussed the matter and has concluded that there is a contradiction in the country's legal procedures where certain republics have already decided not to provide seats for public organizations. He mentions Deputy Ryabchenko's proposal that the representatives of public organizations be given a limited period in which they may hold their seats. The editorial commission is to work on a new variant of the appropriate section.

At 1715 GMT Deputy (Tseplyayev) proposes a compromise variant of the section. Lukyanov suggests moving on to Article 96. He says that people in the hospital should have the right to vote. He reads a proposal submitted by some deputies defining categories of people who should not have the right to vote, including prisoners and the mentally ill.

Lukyanov rereads the amendment and asks for a vote on it: 1,116 vote for; 658 against; 87 abstentions; total—1,861. The amendment has not obtained the necessary two-thirds of the votes. The original wording of the article stands.

At 1732 GMT Deputy Yakovlev, a criminologist, addresses the controversial point of the role of the procuracy in deciding who is to be deprived of the right to vote.

Lukyanov says that in most Western countries criminals and the mentally ill are not permitted to vote.

Deputy Boyars says only a court can decide on guilt, therefore it is wrong for an arrested person to be deprived of his vote while awaiting trial.

Deputy Borodin offers a procedural proposal.

Deputy Vasilyeva complains about an earlier speaker who had offerd an opinion on behalf of the Kazakhstan deputies. She dissassociated herself from such statements, as a Kazakh deputy.

At 1742 GMT Lukyanov says time has run out. He makes some concluding remarks about congress proceedings and declares a break until 1000 Moscow time tomorrow.

Roundup of 18 Dec Congress Proceedings

LD1812182989 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS - By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies today continued the discussion of amendments to constitutional articles concerning elections to republican and local government bodies.

A report was delivered on Saturday by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It was decided that additional amendments that deputies wanted to introduce should be referred to the editorial commission preparing the bill.

Today a general report on the amendments was made by commission chairman Yuriy Manayenkov.

The commission considered more than 70 suggestions that involve 15 articles of the constitution, he said.

During the discussion of amendments to articles concerning the electoral procedure to republican and local government bodies, a particularly keen debate developed over the election of people's deputies from social organisations.

Since this constitutional provision was criticised by the general public, the parliaments of a majority of union republics decided against including it in their constitutions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet also suggested that this provision be excluded from the country's Constitution. But a debate on the issue flared up at the congress with fresh vigour.

During voting at the afternoon session, none of the proposals—to exclude the election from social organisations or keep the possibility of holding them—received the required two-thirds majority.

Opponents will continue to search for appropriate wording of the article.

The deputies did not have enough time to vote on all the suggested amendments and will continue this work on Tuesday.

A package of bills regulating the activities of people's deputies was also submitted to the congress today. It was presented by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities.

A bill "on the status of people's deputies in the USSR" is the core of the package. The need for a single law on the status of people's deputies at all levels is associated primarily with the unity of the system of councils in the country, Nishanov said. By using it, the union republics may specify and supplment the status of their deputies.

The deputies are also expected to vote on these bills on Tuesday.

Speeches, Proceedings at 18 Dec Session

Nishanov Presents Bills on Deputies

LD1812203489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1531 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Speech by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at the 18 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] I would like to dwell in more detail on the basic tenets of the draft legislative acts defining the status of a USSR people's deputy and on other issues relating to the activity of deputies.

First and foremost I would like to note that the need for a single law defining the status of USSR people's deputies on whose basis sovereign republics will be able to adopt repulican laws—if they consider this possible—on people's deputies of soviets at different levels, flows primarily from the unity of the system of soviets in our great country. The fact that in his practical work a deputy acts in an interrelationship with officials and organizations subordinate to the most varied authority—local, republican, and union—also requires legislative regulation of the activity of all deputies. For this reason, the relationship of deputies with all officials and organizations should be and can be defined only by a law of the USSR.

It is also impossible not to take account of the fact that in the activity of deputies there are issues that have to be resolved in the same manner in each union republic. For example, the issue on the protection of the labor rights of deputies, their immunity, their material and financial provision, and so forth.

Finally, it is hardly possible in principle to permit the powers of deputies to be different in various union republics. All the tenets noted provide the opportunity to regard it as necessary that the principles of the content, organization, and activity of a people's deputy should be defined in a single law of the USSR on the status of USSR People's Deputies.

A people's deputy today is the main figure in the soviets of people's deputies at any level. It is very important to fully and accurately define in law the status of deputies, their rights, duties, interrelationship with soviets, voters, state and public organizations, and with officials. The drafts presented aim to resolve these tasks. In elaborating them, the USSR Supreme Soviet proceeded from Leninist ideas on soviets as bodies of genuine democracy.

Comrade deputies, the days have already passed when deputies, formally surrounded by honors and respect, were in fact merely a ceremonial facade of the administrative command system. In the course of the revolutionary renewal of our society begun in April 1985, we have been ridding ourselves of the heavy legacy of the past. [passage omitted]

You know how great the volume is of deputies' affairs in their constituencies and the public organizations from which the deputies have been elected. The section devoted to this issue enshrines a set of rights and obligations. The draft also enshrines the deputy's right to invite officials of state and public bodies and organizations to participate in the reception of citizens. They are obliged to send their representatives to take part in the reception. Deputies are endowed with the right to check up on their own initiative—if necessary by involving the public and people's controllers—instances that have become known to them of violations of legality, or of the rights and interests of citizens or organizations, manifestations of red tape and bureaucratism, and to obtain the information needed to do this and demand the elimination of the violations that have been discovered from the appropriate organs and officials.

One still comes across officials who do not fulfill their obligations before the deputy or who obstruct the effective implementation of his authority, sometimes presenting him wittingly false information, or else violating the guarantees of deputies' activity. I draw your attention to a new provision indicated in Article 7. In such cases, officials are subject to disciplinary accountablity to the extent of releasing them from their duties or administrative or criminal accountability in accordance with the law. The draft enshrines the rights of the deputy to take part and have a consultative voice in sessions of soviets at a lower level. Their organs are to unite in groups of deputies for joint work in constituencies and labor collectives.

Comrades, I would like to draw your attention to the need to establish reciprocal relations that are well founded in law between deputies of various soviets. This is a very important issue. Proposals have been voiced to the effect that USSR people's deputies should be endowed with the right to convene extrarodinary sessions of soviets in their own constituencies, the right to a deciding vote in all soviets at a lower level, the right of veto over decisions by republican organs of authority and local soviets, the right of a provisional veto over decisions of economic, executive, and distributive organs in their own constituencies, etc. But, dear comrades, we have studied all of this carefully, we have compared it with world practice and I must say firmly that it is totally incompatible with the principle of the sovereignty of soviets on their own territory and, for this reason, such proposals cannot be supported. [passage omitted]

Comrades deputies, I would like to touch upon one more small issue. You are aware that the Supreme Soviet carries out broad contacts with foreign parliaments. This is a very necessary direction in the work of our supreme parliament. In the period between the first and second congresses over 20 delegations and groups of USSR people's deputies traveled abroad on official missions. At the same time, one ought to point out the absence of proper order in this matter. A certain section of deputies has been traveling abroad on private invitations, and invitations from various foreign organizations, even during the work of a USSR Supreme Soviet session. Furthermore, certain deputies did not even inform the heads of committees and commissions of the chambers of their trips.

I would like to point out, dear comrades, that in many countries trips by parliamentarians abroad during the period of a parliamentary session are not the general practice. I believe that the situation as far as we are concerned is an abnormal one. Obviously, we need to sort out the whole system of foreign trips by USSR people's deputies. [passage omitted]

In accordance with proposals from many deputies a new section has been included in the new draft law on the organization of work with the mandates of the electorate and public organizations. Originally, the idea was, as you know, to adopt a separate law on mandates. However, during the course of all-around discussion of the numerous versions of the draft law in the committee and commissions, in the working groups, at sessions of the Supreme Soviet, it was recognized as expedient to include the main clauses on mandates in the USSR draft law on the status of peoples deputies, which was also done. The proposed section on mandates contains five articles. In these the determination of mandates is given, the general principles for the procedure for their consideration and implementation are established, as are participation of deputies in the work with mandates and the guaranteeing of glasnost.

The fact must also be taken into account that during the process of the electoral campaign for the election of USSR people's deputies the mandate was already given and measures are being adopted in accordance with it. This, comrades, is already 38,000 mandates given to USSR people's deputies alone. Mandates are being given now during the course of the electoral campaign unfolding in the country for elections to republican and local bodies of power.

The draft distributed to you of important sections on the guarantees of deputies' activities—legal, organizational, and material—is being completed. They have been substantially enriched. In the section the general principles envision in Article 7 are developed on the protection of the rights, honor, and the dignity of the deputy. In the section are many new elements. This concerns in particular the release of deputies from production or legal duties for carrying out deputies' powers when this is necessary, the provision of accomodation for deputies for work, of organizational and technical resources, and transport. The right to have secretarial assistants and public assistants and the right to receive full information on legal issues, the protection of the labor rights of deputies, and the protection of the rights of deputies who are servicemen, among others are envisioned. [passage omitted]

Congress Discusses Bills

LD1812150989 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities, one of the two chambers of the Soviet parliament, today submitted a package of bills regulating the activities of people's deputies to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

A bill "On the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR" is the core of the package. The need for a single law on the status of people's deputies at all levels is associated primarily with the unity of the system of councils in the country, Nishanov said.

The document determines the general rights and deputies of deputies. Using it as a basis, the union republics may specify and supplement the status of their deputies, he added.

The bill states the equal standing of all council deputies and reaffirms the principle that the deputy combines his activities with the performance of his official duties.

At the same time, the document envisages that a certain proportion of deputies focus only on work in the parliaments of the country or republics.

Describing proposals received, Nishanov said in particular that it was suggested that ussr people's deputies be vested with prerogative rights in regard to lower councils, including the right to "veto" their decisions.

Nishanov believes that the proposals cannot be accepted because they contradict the principle of the councils' exercising absolute power on their territories.

The bill "On the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR" includes a new section—on the electorate's mandates—thereby taking into account the opinion of many deputies who believe that a separate law on mandates should not be adopted, as was originally expected.

As for the decision, made during the discussion of the congress's agenda on the drafting of a separate law on the status of people's deputies of the USSR, a bill to this effect has been prepared and may be considered by parliament soon, Nishanov said.

Touching upon the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the first permanently functioning parliament in Soviet history, he voiced concern over the fact that 120 out of 542 members were regularly absent from parliament sittings and more than 70 deputies were absent from almost half of the sittings.

Approximately one-third of the members of parliamentary committees and commissions do not participate in their meetings, Nishanov said.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has also prepared a bill on a procedure to recall a USSR people's deputy that does not justify the constituents' trust, Nishanov said.

Manayenkov on Constitution Changes

LD1812092789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued its work in the Kremlin today. This is its ninth sitting. The chairman, Comrade Lukyanov, gave the floor to Deputy Masnayenkov, the head of the editorial commission for the draft law on the introduction of amendments and addendums to the USSR Constitution connected with the reform of the electoral system. Comrade Manayenkov announced that the commission, with the involvement of academics and lawyers, has closely studied proposals contained in the speeches and notes of 72 deputies. It is proposed that a number of clarifications be made to the draft law on this basis.

Deputies Debate Amendments

LD1812120989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] At their morning session today, the participants in the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies proposed examining the introduction of amendments and addenda to the USSR Constitution relating to the electoral system. To start with, Comrade Lukyanov, in the chair, offered the floor to Deputy Manayenkov, head of the editorial commission for the draft law on the introduction of amendments and addenda to the USSR Constitution. Comrade Manayenkov reported that with the involvement of lawyers, the commission had carefully studied the proposals contained in speeches and notes from 72 deputies. On this basis it proposed introducing a number of amplifications into the draft law.

The head of the editorial commission answered deputies' questions. Fervent debates then began, with 21 people taking part. These were Deputies Burlatskiy, Yevtushenko, Shapovalenko, Belozertsev, Klochkov, Sobchak, Kim, Dyadenko, Boldarev, Venediktov, Khmura, Stadnik, Kazannik, Zaslavskiy, Ryabchenko, Krayko, Kirilov, Alksnis, Kuznetsov, Starovoytova, Boyars.

The discussion developed primarily around two articles—Article 95 in connection with elections from public organizations, and Article 96 in connection with voting rights. However, the deputies did touch upon other articles of the draft law, as well. The most varied and occasionally opposing points of view were expressed. Compromise versions were suggested. USSR People's Deputies Burlatskiy, Yevtushenko, Shapovalenko, Zaslavskiy, and others spoke in favor of waiving elections from public organizations and, among others, People's Deputies Dyadenko, Klochkov, and Venediktov spoke in favor of their being retained. Deputy Kim suggested a compromise proposal.

It was also proposed to place two points of the draft law under examination, relating to instructions to the Supreme Soviet, in separate resolutions from the Congress. The debates were then interrupted to say farewell to Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov.

The next session of USSR People's Deputies is scheduled for 1600.

Debate on Article 95 Detailed

LD1812163289 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies today did not decide on the wording of the Soviet Constitution's Article 95.

The article envisages the possibility of electing deputies from social organisations (in accordance with the constitution, one-third of the USSR People's Deputies are elected by social organisations, not by the population).

During the discussion of amendments to articles concerning the electoral procedure to republican and local government bodies, a particularly keen debate developed over the election of people's deputies from social organisations.

Since this constitutional provision was criticised by the general public, the parliaments of a majority of union republics decided against including it in their constitutions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet also suggested that this provision be excluded from the country's Constitution. But a debate on the issue flared up at the congress with fresh vigour.

A number of deputies suggested that the principle of elections from social organisations only apply to those organisations that represent the interests of the least protected social groups—the disabled, war veterans, and orphans.

During the voting at the afternoon session, none of the proposals—to exclude the election from social organisations or keep the possibility of holding them—received the required two-thirds majority.

Opponents will continue to search for appropriate wording of the article.

Supreme Soviet

Officials Brief Press on Supreme Soviet Session

90UN0460A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 49, 9 Dec-15 Dec 89 p 2

[Text] At a press conference held in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center, Soviet and foreign journalists were addressed by A.I. Lukyanov, candidate of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Ye.M. Primakov, candidate of the Politburo and chairman of the Soviet of the Union; and R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. The speeches summed up the Second Session of the Supreme Soviet and described the preparations for the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

A.I. Lukyanov observed in his opening remarks that the agenda and content of the work of the session had confirmed convincingly that the USSR Supreme Soviet was justifying its purpose, mastering better and better the authority of the country's permanent, legislative, administrative, and control organ of power. The Supreme Soviet at its session examined 29 of the planned 34 items and, in addition, studied in supplementary manner a further 20 important questions in the life of the country, the development of our legislation, the strengthening of law and order, and so forth.

A.I. Lukyanov went on to dwell on the items which the USSR Supreme Soviet proposed including on the agenda of the upcoming congress. These were such items as:

- recognition of the authority of the deputies elected since the First Congress of People's Deputies;
- measures pertaining to economic recovery, stages of the economic reform, and fundamental approaches to the elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan;
- changes and additions to the USSR Constitution on questions of the electoral system;
- standing orders of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies;
- draft laws on the status of people's deputies and other questions of the activity of the people's deputies;
- a draft law on constitutional supervision in the USSR;
- election of a constitutional supervision committee;
- intensification of the fight against organized crime;
- reports of the commissions formed by the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

It is intended that the congress will be in session for approximately 10 days.

A broad deputies' commission consisting of more than 80 deputies representing all the republics and all commissions of the Supreme Soviet and deputies from various deputy groups—deputies from worker, veteran, agrarian specialist, regional, and interregional groups—was formed a month ago for tackling practical questions connected with preparation of the congress.

In the 2 months prior to the start of the congress, the deputies obtained all material pertaining to the congress, as envisaged.

Question: A question which is not on the agenda is that concerning Article 6 of the USSR Constitution. A question of a procedural nature: What opportunity will the deputies have for inserting an extra item on the agenda in connection with Article 6?

Primakov: The proposal that Article 6 be submitted for discussion did not receive the necessary number of votes, and thus this item is not on the agenda per the Supreme Soviet's recommendation to the congress. As far as Article 6 generally is concerned, we of course affirm the change in the party's role in the process of perestroyka and we understand that the party's role is being modernized; it remains the leading, vanguard force in our society, but nonetheless the functions of state power, for example, are exercised by the soviets, and the executive authorities have their own functions.

The role of the party is undergoing a certain modernization. This will, consequently, possibly put on the agenda a change in the corresponding article also, but we are for this happening constitutionally, as in all civilized countries. This, incidentally, is not the sole article of the Constitution which needs to be changed; there is a whole number of other articles as well. A constitutional commission is at work. This is the constitutional process, and we are against any adjustments being made to it which may not consolidate our society but which, on the contrary, could lead to it's being divided.

As far as the party's leading role is concerned, from our viewpoint the preservation of this role is extremely necessary at the time of perestroyka. It is not only a question of the fact that the party, and not some nonparty force, began and is implementing perestroyka. The point is that the party is the force consolidating the federation, consolidating the ongoing movement in support of the renovation of society.

Lukyanov: If you are interested in procedural issues, the congress will discuss and confirm the final agenda. As far as the Supreme Soviet's position is concerned, it has been expressed clearly and definitely.

Question: You surely know that prior to the congress there could be, as A. Sakharov reported, a strike connected with the question of the party's leading role. How do you view these plans?

Lukyanov: We know that an appeal of six USSR people's deputies on the question of the possibility of staging a two-hour strike was published abroad. It has to be said that we spoke yesterday (4 December—editor) with these deputies, ascertaining their position insofar as this position is at variance with the Supreme Soviet's opinion in respect of strikes. This opinion was unequivocally expressed in the Supreme Soviet appeal of 25 July and in the Supreme Soviet decree on the prevention and undesirability of strikes in the fall-winter period in the base sectors of industry. So the Supreme Soviet itself has answered the question, and this initiative is at variance with its clearly expressed wishes.

Question: Even our press contains the most contradictory information concerning the state of the voting electronics. Could you not describe it in more detail?

Nishanov: For the purpose of facilitating the vote-counting process during the congress of people's deputies we had a number of contacts with overseas firms which might have become most actively involved in the creation of this mechanism. We chose the Philips company. But, unfortunately, the Philips company had only 400 transportable machines ready, and we needed at least 800. Four hundred will do for us also, only there will now be six voting slots per transportable machine. This could perhaps create some inconveniences for the deputies, but will nonetheless speed up the tallying of the vote by a factor of five to six compared with voting by a show of hands.

Question: Will there be a rotation of the Supreme Soviet at the congress?

Lukyanov: The Constitution records that rotation has to take place once a year. Consequently, this rotation will evidently be conducted next time. The Supreme Soviet has not put the question of rotation on the agenda this time.

Supreme Soviet Session, Amnesty Law Viewed

90UN0405A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev and Captain 3rd Rank V. Urban: "The Debates Come to An End"]

[Text] The Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ended its work. The last 2 days might be called the most difficult. Not only because 10 issues were being considered at the same time because many of them that had more than once been passed to parliamentary committees and commissions were raised at the joint session of the chambers. It was something else.

In our opinion the prize at the end was somehow focused on the pluses and minuses of the new Supreme Soviet. Hence we may sometimes run to extremes of emotion and the furious clash of opinion. But the parliament has also demonstrated its readiness to reach reasonable compromise. For politics is the art of the possible, and it is precisely from this that we shall start.

On Monday the Law on Economic Independence for the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], Latvian SSR, and Estonian SSR was passed. A total of 67 deputies voted "against" and 87 abstained. For initially the debate was bogged down in amendments and things went slowly and unproductively. A seemingly normal phenomenon. But the draft had been approved during its reading at the first session and had been through months of confirmation in the USSR Council of Ministers. Amendments and clarifications were worked out by a conciliation commission made up of deputies and eminent economists in the country.

It was not happenstance that after the latest wave of comments on the draft, when the Baltic deputies had gathered to "take counsel," Deputy S.B. Stankevich reminded them of the decision: it was possible to vote only for those amendments that had been approved by the committees and commissions. During the course of the debate M.S. Gorbachev spoke several times in his capacity as chairman. In particular he recalled that we need this kind of law because it is aimed at strengthening federation. To judge from everything, it was only after this conversation that the discussion moved along its regular course.

But in conclusion the deputies almost reached the unanimous opinion that the law will enable the experience of the three republics to be used to lay the practical groundwork for the switch to regional cost accounting and independence.

Together with the economic laws that the deputies regarded as urgent, in these 2 days the Supreme Soviet also examined a number of others that cannot be delayed. They included a draft decree on amnesty for former servicemen in the contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan who committed crimes. We recall that the first version of the draft was submitted right at the start of the session. But it satisfied neither the parliamentarians nor the commissions, and the differing opinions and the wishes of the public have been under discussion all this time. Deputy Yu.V. Golik spoke about this when he presented a report on behalf of the Committee on Questions of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order.

Let us note immediately that the document itself, based on the principles of humanitarianism, did not meet with objections from the deputies. It is proposed to free former servicemen from criminal liability for crimes committed during the time that they were doing military service in Afghanistan. It contains proposals to release persons convicted by USSR courts and the courts of the union republics for crimes committed during service in Afghanistan, and also to expunge the convictions of those released on the basis of this amnesty, and those who have already served sentences for crimes committed.

There was dispute only on one point—No 4—which excludes the possibility of amnesty for those who took part in premeditated murder. Most of those speaking made reference to the inadequate stipulations in the draft decree according to which the amnesty might affect persons who committed murder while in a state of strong spiritual emotion or when exceeding the limits of necessary defense. Deputies commented on this: How does one define that boundary that separates the crime of a person who commits murder through his own volition from the act of a soldier who is forced to act under the muzzle of the enemy pistol or under the influence of narcotics?

Deputies who had themselves participated in the Afghan war, in particular P.V. Shetko and R.K. Odzhiyev, proposed that this point be deleted since it hampers the return to the motherland of servicemen who are in the hands of the Afghan armed opposition. We did not come to this decision easily, they said, but nonetheless you must understand that it is essential for at present any prisoner of war may be "accused of a crime." We must take advantage of any chance to to free our young men, and today we have such a chance, stressed Deputy Captain A.S. Kolodeznikov.

In fact, in any war, sooner or later the question of prisoners arises. The war in Afghanistan is no exception. This was also confirmed by the debates in parliament. Summing up, as it were, the results of this debate, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akromeyev said: "I think it proper that this time in the clash between civic positions and considerations of clemency and humanitarianism, we must give preference to the latter." He also proposed that the reasons for the Supreme Soviet taking this step should be explained to the people.

The thorny point was excluded from the draft and the deputies approved this decree by a majority vote. It comes into force on 16 December. On the same day the Supreme Soviet issued an appeal to all peoples, parliaments, governments, and public organizations in foreign countries and all people of good will, asking for every possible kind of help in returning former servicemen of the contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan to their motherland.

The last issue dealt with by the session was consideration of the draft Law on Vacations. Deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers A.P. Biryukov presented the report. In its first reading the Supreme Soviet approved the main provisions of the draft and assigned the government and the appropriate committees and commissions to do further work on it and publish it for national debate.

Giving due consideration to the social importance of the Law on Vacations, we recall the essence of the changes proposed. It is not first and foremost a question of introducing separate changes when reviewing vacation time. A fundamentally new mechanism is being created for organizational, economic, and legal procedures, which will insure conditions for the restoration of work capacity and proper leisure for Soviet people.

More than 90 million workers will receive additional vacation time. The minimum vacation will be 21 calendar days, and 28 days with seniority.

Thus, we can sum up the results. And this was done in the concluding words of the chairman at the evening session, A.I. Lukyanov. He noted that the main tasks set for the parliament by the Congress of USSR Deputies for its second session have been completed. The agenda included 34 items. Over the 2-month period 29 of them had been examined, including 19 priority tasks. In addition, 20 matters that were additionally included because life demanded a decision have also been considered. During this period of the session important legislative enactments have been adopted, such as the Law on Leasing and the Law on Economic Independence for the Baltic Republics, and changes have been made to the Law on the Cooperative System. Six very important laws that will determine both the life and the course of the economic reform and resolve many social problems have been submitted for debate. They include the draft laws on ownership, on land, on pensions, on the public foundations of local self-management, on the press, and on vacations. A whole series of law was examined during the first reading, and active work on them continues in the parliamentary committees and commissions.

The links between the Supreme Soviet and the population have recently been strengthened. Several hundred thousand letters have been received from the public. People's deputies have personally received more than 1,000 persons submitting complaints, statements, and proposals.

The second session of the Congress of USSR Deputies will open in exactly 2 weeks. Deputies will use the time that remains to study its materials and meet with voters. A.I. Lukyanov passed on to the deputies the wishes of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to prepare carefully and with a proper sense of responsibility for the upcoming Congress, and his opinion that the USSR Supreme Soviet will increasingly gain strength and act vigorously in all spheres in leading the life of our society, and his desire that the slogan on the popular power of the soviets become increasingly stable and more palpable for the people. And this means that perestroyka and the reform of the political system will be moving ahead.

PRAVDA Carries Correction to Lease Legislation

PM1512142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[Unattributed "Correction"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat reports that in Article 5 of the USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution "On the Procedure for Introducing the Fundamentals of USSR and Union Republic Legislation on Leaseholding," published 1 December this year, "1990" should read "1989."

Political and Social

Sakharov Funeral, Eulogies Described

LD1812164989 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—Thousands of people today thronged Luzhniki Central Stadium Square to mourn Academician Andrey Sakharov, the eminent Soviet scientist and civic leader, people's deputy of the USSR, who died suddenly on Thursday.

Along with people's deputies of the USSR, the meeting was attended by members of the public, heads and members of diplomatic missions, and foreign guests.

"We came here to honour the memory of humanity's great man, a citizen not only of our own country, but of all the world," People's Deputy Academician Dmitriy Likhachev said opening the meeting. "He was a real prophet in the ancient, true, sense of the word, a man who urged his contemporaries to moral revival for the sake of the future."

"Andrey Sakharov was an embodiment of all the best qualities bequeathed to us by the great Russian intelligentsia," stressed People's Deputy poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. He said Andrey Sakharov adhered in all his endeavours to the principles of humanism professed by great Russian writers—Tolstoy, Dostoyevskiy and Chekhov. Yevtushenko read out his poem dedicated to Sakharov's memory.

Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, People's Deputy Academician Yuriy Osipyan said that Andrey Sakharov was "one of the greatest scientists of our epoch." "There are different people in this square today," he noted. "They include not only Sakharov's old supporters, but those who are now trying to find their own way guided by his ideas. But we all are united by boundless respect for Sakharov's outstanding personality."

"All the most important events of the Twentieth Century were surprisingly reflected in Sakharov's personal destiny," Yuriy Osipyan said. "He took part in the development of nuclear weapons, because he believed that the world could be saved from a catastrophe only if the USSR had such weapons. And he campaigned with equal vigour and self-sacrifice for the banning of nuclear weapons, for a nuclear free world, for disarmament, for freedom and human rights. This struggle will always be linked with Andrey Sakharov's name," the academician stressed.

Sakharov was well-known in Italy not only to specialists but also to common people, Deputy Prime Minister Claudio Martelli said. He set an example in the struggle for independence of humanity, for human rights.

Today when his voice can no longer be heard, his ideas are alive, the ideas upholding such aims as freedom, independence and solidarity, he noted.

It is a great loss for Lithuania, too, People's Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis said. Solemn music can be heard today in Vilnius's Cathedral Square and people converged on the square to say good words about Sakharov.

Speaking at the funeral ceremony, People's Deputy Olzhas Suleymenov said a film, "Nevada-Semipalatinsk", was being made at the Kazakh Film studio. Andrey Sakharov agreed to appear in that film to tell everything he knew about the history of nuclear weapon tests in the Soviet Union.

One of the initiators of the Moscow 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, space and under water, Sakharov was well aware of the shortfalls of that treaty and insisted on banning underground tests as well.

"Fate willed it that Sakharov become the father of Soviet thermonuclear weapons," physicist Yefim Fradkin, who worked with Sakharov, said at the funeral rally.

"He took up the problem because he was sure it would secure a way to balance forces in order to ensure peace," Fradkin stressed.

Condolences from the Polish people, the Solidarity trade union and the Polish parliament were expressed by Polish Senator Zbiegnew Romaszewski. He said Solidarity leader Lech Walesa could not arrive in Moscow on time due to bad weather.

"May this day," Metropolitan Pitirim said, "remain in our memory as a constant reminder about conscience, kindness and charity."

"Andrey Sakharov was not only a great scientist but also a great politician," People's Deputy Gavriil Popov said. "The end of the Twentieth Century is an era when a mankind that has been making wars throughout the century is beginning to become aware of its primal community. It is an epoch when priority is given to universal human values, an epoch of universal historical compromise between socialism, which has begun restructuring, and the world of capitalism, which has been reforming all these years.

"The significance of Andrey Sakharov consists first and foremost in his ability to understand the basic task for this crucial moment—the task to achieve a historic compromise".

Mikhail Gorbachev and other leaders of the Soviet Communist Party, state and government paid their homage to Andrey Sakharov this morning.

The funeral took place this afternoon at the Vostryakovskoye Cemetery and was attended by relatives and other people who were near and dear to Sakharov.

Gorbachev, Others Sign Obituary

PM1812170389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Text] Moscow, 16 Dec (TASS)—Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, one of the major scientists of contemporary times, well-known public figure, USSR People's Deputy, member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences and holder of the Nobel Peace Prize, died on 14 December 1989.

A.D. Sakharov was born in Moscow on 21 May 1921 to a teaching family. On completing Moscow State University (which had been evacuated to Ashkhabad at that time), he was sent to work at the laboratory of the "Volodarskiy" defense works in Ulyanovsk, where he was responsible for a number of technical inventions and at the same time wrote a number of works on theoretical physics. In 1945 A.D. Sakharov was accepted for postgraduate studies at the Institute of Physics of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Here he carried out a number of important pieces of research and arrived at the idea of carrying out thermonuclear fusion both for controlled (civilian) use and for defense use (the hydrogen bomb), and subsequently he began to work on the problem of creating a hydrogen weapon. Deeply convinced that peace could only be preserved if there was an equilibrium between the principal opposing sides, he dedicated many years to this cause.

From 1950 to 1969 A.D. Sakharov worked (among other things, as deputy scientific chief) at the All-Union Experimental Physics Research Institute, where his creative gifts and inventiveness were brilliantly displayed. His services were recognized with the Lenin and State prizes in 1956 and 1953 respectively and three gold stars of Hero of Socialist Labor in 1954, 1956, and 1962. He was elected academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1953.

While working on the development of a weapon of mass destruction, A.D. Sakharov grasped at an early stage the danger for mankind of its wide production and testing and insistently confronted the government with the question of limiting such tests. However, at that time his appeals were not understood. He stood up for those views in future years as well.

Gross injustice was committed with regard to A.D. Sakharov. He was exiled from Moscow to the city of Gorkiy. In 1986 that decision was cancelled, and he returned to active scientific and public activity.

The political confrontation took a lot of strength out of A.D. Sakharov. However, even at a difficult time for him he continued to engage fruitfully in science. His outstanding works on elementary particle physics and cosmology appeared. One of his remarkable achievements was the idea of the instability of one of the basic elementary particles, the proton. The idea seemed unrealistic at first, but after a few years world science proclaimed the search for the disintegration of the proton the "experiment of the century." He also put forward equally original ideas in cosmology.

A.D. Sakharov's scientific works were always distinguished by their vivid originality and novelty of ideas. As early as during his work on weapons, he put forward the idea of building controlled thermonuclear reactors, and also researched the problem of muon nuclear catalysis. He suggested a method of creating extra-strong magnetic fields.

All those who knew him, even if they also disagreed with him on some things, share the bitterness of the loss that has befallen them. An outstanding scientist and public figure, a man of honesty and sincerity, has passed away.

Everything that Andrey Dmitriyevich did was dictated by his conscience and by his deep humanistic convictions.

[Signed] Gorbachev M.S., Vorotnikov V.I., Zaykov L.N., Medvedev V.A., Ryzhkov N.I., Yakovlev A.N., Lukyanov A.I., Primakov Ye.M., Frolov I.T., Marchuk G.I., Abalkin L.I., Laverov N.P., Ryabev L.D., Aganbegyan A.G., Aleksandrov A.P., Alferov Zh.I., Arbatov G.A., Basov N.G., Belyayev S.T., Brekhovskikh L.M., Buslayev Yu.A., Velikhov Ye.P., Ginzburg V.L., Golitsyn G.S., Gonchar A.A., Yemelyanov S.V., Ilichev V.I., Kabanov V.A., Keldysh L.V., Koptyug V.A., Kovalchenko I.D., Kostyuk P.G., Kudravtsev V.N., Likhachev D.S., Logunov A.A., Makarov I.M., Mesyats G.A., Mirzabekov A.D., Nefedov O.M., Osipyan Yu.A., Paton B.Ye., Prokhorov A.M., Rudenko Yu.N., Sagdeyev R.Z., Simonov P.V., Skrinskiy A.N., Sokolov B.S., Sokolov V.Ye., Spirin A.S., Subbotin V.I., Utkin V.F., Faddeyev L.D., Frolov K.V., Khariton Yu.B., Chelyshev Ye.P. Saykin V.T.

Maneuvers To Block Yeltsin Meeting Reported

PM1312152489 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 49, 3 Dec 89 p 14

[Vladimir Voronin report: "Which Were The Motives?"]

[Text] On November 17 voters from the Bibirevo neighbourhood of Moscow were to meet with Boris Yeltsin, people's deputy from Moscow. But those invited to the Budapest cinema and concert hall, the planned venue for the meeting, were confronted by reinforced militia patrols and several sand-spraying trucks which were cruising around the building to bar all approaches to it. The meeting was aborted. How did it happen?

The idea of such a meeting during which a deputy could report his activity to the people who had voted him into office emerged long ago. We, residents of the neighbourhood, discussed the possibility of leasing the building for that purpose (the lease payment was guaranteed by the voters) with the officials of the Kirovskiy District Soviet Executive Committee as early as in late October. They did not oppose our plans. But as soon as the plan began to be implemented, some obstacles (which remain unclear fo us even now) emerged. We were denied the premises of the cinema and concert hall on the pretext advanced by Chairman of the District Soviet Executive Committee Aleksandr Poddubskiy, that local residents wanted a cinema show, rather than the planned meeting on that day. Then the voters willing to meet with their deputy bought up the house for the night. I wonder if a film was shown to an empty hall sealed off by the militia and the sand-spraying trucks that evening. However the meeting had to be called off.

Yeltsin as a person and his political position may be understood differently. But I cannot understand who found it worthwhile to increase tensions around a natural and perfectly legal thing such as a meeting between a deputy and voters and to create an aura of "forbiddenness" around the name of the deputy.

Yakovlev Returns From GDR Visit

LD1512221189 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Berlin today.

Yakovlev was in the German Democratic Republic on a working visit at the invitation of the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Lithuanian Party Congress Previewed

LD1812220189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; by V. Beketov]

[Text] The 20th Extraordinary Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party opens in Vilnius tomorrow.

As was mentioned at the news conference that took place today, issues on which the future fate of the republican Communist Party and, without exaggeration, the fate of every Lithuanian Communist hinge are to be discussed by delegates. Already the first clause of the Lithuanian Communist Party draft status, published before the congress, gives rise to the most contradictory views. It proclaims the Lithuanian Communist Party an independent political organization and a component of the republic's social and political system and the international communist movement. It maintains links with progressive parties and organizations and with those whose aspirations are dear to the Lithuanian Communist Party. Neither this clause nor the following ones contain a single word about links and cooperation with the CPSU.

[Unidentified reporter] As is well known, 2 weeks ago Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent a letter to the Lithuanian Communists. How was this letter received in the Republic's party organizations, and has there been any th Extraordinary Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party opened in Vilnius today. The delegates will discuss the programme of the 200,000-strong party organisation in the context of Soviet perestroyka.

As many as 1,038 delegates are attending the congress, almost 94 percent—with a higher or incomplete higher education. An overwhelming majority of the delegates are intellectuals. Among the delegates there are members of various public organisations including the Lithuanian Sajudis Movement for Perestroyka.

At a news conference held before the congress the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Valerijonas Baltrunas said that the congress would hear the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's political report. It will be delivered by the republican Communist Party chief Algirdas-Mikolas Brazauskas today.

The delegates will also discuss the party draft programme and rules to be adopted by the republican Communist Party for the first time since 1940.

A sociological public opinion poll on fundamental questions of the party's activities and strategy was held among delegates on the eve of the congress. Some of them favour the renewal of the Lithuanian Communist Party within the Soviet Communist Party, while others support the Lithuanian Communist Party's independence and partnership relations with the Soviet Communist Party and other parties.

Radically-minded communists view a future Lithuanian Communist Party as a fully independent political party with its programme and rules and a new name, a party that would function in the context of a multi-party political structure. Observers say that this might lead to a split in the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Over 250 journalists, among them foreign correspondents from 20 countries, will provide coverage of the congress.

Party Congress Opens in Vilnius

LD1912093389 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 19 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The 20th Extraordinary Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party opened in Vilnius today. The delegates will discuss the programme of the 200,000-strong party organisation in the context of Soviet perestroyka.

As many as 1,038 delegates are attending the congress, almost 94 percent—with a higher or incomplete higher education. An overwhelming majority of the delegates are intellectuals. Among the delegates there are members of various public organisations including the Lithuanian Sajudis Movement for Perestroyka.

At a news conference held before the congress the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Valerijonas Baltrunas said that the congress would hear the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's political report. It will be delivered by the republican Communist Party chief Algirdas-Mikolas Brazauskas today.

The delegates will also discuss the party draft programme and rules to be adopted by the republican Communist Party for the first time since 1940.

A sociological public opinion poll on fundamental questions of the party's activities and strategy was held among delegates on the eve of the congress. Some of them favour the renewal of the Lithuanian Communist Party within the Soviet Communist Party, while others support the Lithuanian Communist Party's independence and partnership relations with the Soviet Communist Party and other parties.

Radically-minded communists view a future Lithuanian Communist Party as a fully independent political party with its programme and rules and a new name, a party that would function in the context of a multi-party political structure. Observers say that this might lead to a split in the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Over 250 journalists, among them foreign correspondents from 20 countries, will provide coverage of the congress.

Baltrunas Interviewed on Congress

LD1812184489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The delegates to the extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP] are gathering in Vilnius today.

[Adolfas Paulyus] The working day here, in the building of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, starts early, and not only today, when literally 24 hours remain until the opening of the Congress. Work has been in full swing here also throughout all the preceding days, mostly because, as you probably know, a debate has been going on inside the party since the beginning of the year about the past, the present, and the future of the Communist Party, and the summing up of the results required a lot of work. So what are the communists proposing? I am talking to Valerijonas Baltrunas, secretary of the Central Committee.

[Baltrunas] You are right in saying that the discussion concerns three issues—the past, the present, and the future of the Lithuanian CP, which is on everyone's mind, and first and foremost on the republic's communists' minds and ours too—the ability to resolve independently all problems in our work, the ability to solve independently political, economic and other issues. These issues have an even wider sense because of the recently adopted law on economic independence for the three Baltic republics and this too is very closely linked.

In connection with this there is a sharp debate on what the future relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will be. But the main subject of today's debate and of all today's problems which are being discussed on the eve of the Congress and which will be hotly debated at the Congress, is the future of the Republic itself and what position will the Lithuanian CP occupy in the determination of that future. But I am certain of one thing, that the sober, calm, and sensible tendency will win at the Congress and I think that a considered decision will be adopted. The fact that we are starting the Congress with two draft programs shows that we do indeed have many issues on which today it is still difficult to find a common point of view, and it is even possible that no program will be adopted at the Congress but it will merely be discussed in the first reading.

[Paulyus] Right now there is much talk about what the party will be like at the end of this Congress, what consequences will the Congress have. Opinions are virtually diametrically opposite. While some say the Lithuanian CP is going to come out of the Congress lifeless and broken, others maintain it will be strengthened, more united and authoritative after the Congress. I know that right now it is not very popular in this building to make forecasts aloud, but would you mind?

[Baltrunas] Obviously, making early and unconsidered forecasts would be irresponsible. But we would very much like to believe, and I am convinced of it, that the Lithuanian CP after the Congress is going to be even stronger and more united. [video shows Paulyus interviewing Baltrunas]

Lithuanian Party, Informals Relations Viewed

90UN0436B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Dec 89 p 2

[Report on interview with the first secretary of the Kayshyadorskiy Rayon Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, Vatslovas Litvinas, by the SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent in Lithuania, N. Lashkevich: "Dialogue Is Needed"; date and location not given]

[Text] Perhaps no sphere of public and political life can be found at present in Lithuania in which stormy processes of perestroyka are not underway. They have not passed by the Communist Party of Lithuania, which is preparing to hold its 20th congress. Recently a plenum of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party was held. The communists listened attentively to the appeal by M.S. Gorbachev "To the Communists of Lithuania," which, along with a principled assessment of the position of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the issue of the party's independent status, includes the call for a dialogue, for the consolidation of all progressive forces.

Vigorous activities of new public and political organizations and movements have given an impetus of sorts to the reconsideration in the republic of the role of the Communist Party of Lithuania in its society. The nature of mutual relations between party organizations and various informal movements and organizations is the topic of our interview today. The first secretary of the Kayshyadorskiy Rayon Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, Vatslovas Litvinas, talks to our correspondent.

[Lashkevich] Vatslovas Pyatrovich, much criticism leveled at the republic party organizations has been aired recently. A certain degree of concern was also reflected in the recent appeal by the CPSU general secretary "To the Communists of Lithuania." The setting up of a republic communist party independent from the CPSU, this document stresses, would bring to naught the results of the actual development of Lithuania, would strike a blow at perestroyka as a whole. Party functionaries and committees have frequently been rebuked in the press for not being up to the challenge. Do you believe this criticism is also leveled at you?

[Litvinas] Yes, to a certain degree. However, the trend toward some bewilderment among party leaders in the face of mounting problems occurs not only in Lithuania or other Baltic republics. I believe it is characteristic of the country as a whole. We need to grasp soberly the processes underway in our society more than ever before. We would make a mistake if, proceeding from a false interpretation of party principles, we reject cooperation with various informal organizations and groups and give up our search for ways toward a dialogue with a view to working out positive solutions. Sajudis is a real political force in Lithuania which has numerous strata of the population on its side. Failing to understand this would be at the very least naive. Therefore, we should look for common ground without renouncing our convictions in the course of resolving the issues of principle. Taking into account the peculiarities of the development of the political process in Lithuania and the considerable influence of various informal movements on public opinion (I admit that the term "informal movements" is somewhat conventional), the Communists of Lithuania arrive at the conclusion that radical changes in the party are necessary. Otherwise, it will be difficult for the party to lay claim to a leadership role in society. I view the appeal by M.S. Gorbachev primarily as a call for a realistic appraisal of the situation in the republic, our country, and the world, which would make it possible to avoid a split at the turning point of perestroyka.

[Lashkevich] Which informal movements, organizations, and groups are active in your rayon?

[Litvinas] First of all, Sajudis, the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka. The "Greens" are very active. We are located in the so-called "black triangle" of Lithuania: We are surrounded by the Kedayne Chemical Plant, the Yonava Production Association "Nitrogen," and the Lithuanian GRES [State Regional Power Station]. The Kayshyadoris Pumped Storage Power Station is being built nearby. By Lithuanian standards, these are giant enterprises which have been polluting the environment for many years being the catalysts of ecological tension. This is why it is natural that the "greens" have embarked on extensive activities here. On the whole, the party raykom [rayon committee] supports this movement, and we appreciate its concern and protest against the threatening ecological situation which has emerged in the rayon. However, we do not support the ultra-radical slogans of some representatives of the "greens" on the immediate closure and mothballing of these enterprises.

The adherents of new informal associations calling themselves the parties of Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, Democrats, and the union of workers have also been appearing in our rayon. As we can see, the spectrum of sociopolitical forces is quite broad.

In conjunction with this, our tactic is as follows: cooperation, search for avenues toward mutually acceptable solutions with healthy, progressive forces, and distancing ourselves from all kinds of extremists attempting to gain political capital in the course of the process of democratization of our society. We are against the forces which exploit the national self-awareness of the people setting forth at times the provocative slogans of interethnic discord and exclusive rights of the indigenous population to the detriment of the interests of other nationalities. We are not taking the same path they do. However, the fact that they appear in the political arena is, to my mind, an objective phenomenon. The wave of national renaissance, the movement for a sovereign, democratic, socialist Lithuania, naturally carries froth with it. Therefore, we should not make the situation dramatic by accusing the informal movements of separatism, nationalism, and other "vices." There are definitely radicals in their midst who naively believe that the independence of Lithuania may be introduced by some piece of legislation: today within the USSR, tomorrow complete independence. Sometimes, this "naivete" is just for show. Their tactics are understandable: Set goals which cannot be achieved at the present stage, and later collect political dividends on the pretext of economic and social difficulties and assert their own authority.

[Lashkevich] Do you allow for such a possibility as well?

[Litvinas] Why not? There has never been a dearth of such politicians at the turning points in history. Also, there is the opposite: One may proclaim out loud that perestroyka in the country is in danger, the country is on the eve of disintegration, and prepare the people for the concept that "an iron fist" is as necessary as ever under the current circumstances. Fortunately, neither of the two determine the "climate" of the social and political life of the republic.

One more thing: To my mind, many people in our country are too sensitive in their perception of the thesis on the right of republics to secede from the USSR. After all, the right of a union republic to self-determination up to secession is codified in the USSR Constitution now in effect. It is another matter how to exercise this right, if at all. However, such a right of the people should exist in the legislative practice. We communists fight for a realistic approach to exercising the right to self-determination. We cannot foster illusions among the people.... In general, a union needs to be created from which nobody would like to secede, and from which it would not be advantageous for anyone to secede.

[Lashkevich] Are you concerned about the delineation of sociopolitical forces in the republic occurring mainly along ethnic lines?

[Litvinas] Of course, on the whole it is an unhealthy phenomenon because the notion "national" may turn into "nationalist" at a certain stage. At any rate, this possibility cannot be ruled out. I would like to believe that the Lithuanian people will have enough common sense in order not to stoop to nationalist positions. I believe that there is nothing unexpected in the fact that ethnic ideas and feelings come to the fore in the course of perestroyka. It is another matter that they should not be allowed to gain the upper hand over common sense, the feeling of realism, and to infringe on the interests of other ethnic groups and communities. On the whole, this division is a temporary phenomenon. According to the data of sociological polls and surveys, the number of people of non-Lithuanian nationalities supporting the Sajudis platform is growing. However, the Communist

Party is the main political nucleus which representatives of all nationalities residing in the territory of Lithuania rally around.

[Lashkevich] You maintain that the authority of the Communist Party of Lithuania has increased considerably. How then do you interpret the fact that more and more communists are leaving the party?

[Litvinas] To my mind, we should not have delusions about the very great authority of the party in the period of stagnation. The command-bureaucratic system has left its negative imprint on the activities of the party as well. At present, when we shed the burden of the past, many people get the impression that we are losing our advanced positions. This is not so. To the contrary, it is right now, in the process of perestroyka, especially at its present stage, that the party is restoring its good name, honestly and courageously acknowledging its mistakes, renouncing many functions which do not belong to it, and setting clear and precise goals for the people. In this regard, the informal movements are, if I might say so, good irritants; they prompt a search for optimal solutions to problems, leaving the offices, getting away from the papers, and being in the midst of the people.

Indeed, this year more than 30 candidates in our rayon refused to join the party. Indeed, the number of those who put their party membership cards on the table is increasing. However, this does not at all mean that a negative intraparty process is underway. Any revolutionary renewal of our society reveals in the party both its genuine adherents and "fellow travelers" who used the title of communist for personal gain in their time. At present, when the party is at a complex stage of its development and has stopped giving incentives for securing certain benefits in life, they are in a hurry to leave its ranks.

When did they lie: when they joined the party in the time of stagnation, behind the screen of lofty phrases, or this time? Most often they state in their petitions that they do not want to throw in their lot with the party which has besmirched itself by exiling people, shootings, persecution for dissent, and so on. Could it be that they did not know it before? Maybe it was advantageous not to know? Indeed, the party is responsible for these actions but the present generation of communists cannot be blamed for all of it. At the same time, to my mind, the CPSU should condemn openly the violations of Leninist norms and distance itself from a number of ideas which originated in the Stalinist past.

I am certain that an increase in the authority of the Communist Party of Lithuania will be facilitated by giving it a status different from the one it has now. At issue is the establishment of a new structure of relations with the CPSU. It is difficult to implement the concept of economic independence of the republic without reorganizing the party.

Incidentally, this issue was raised with complete clarity in the appeal by M.S. Gorbachev: How are we to take the route of increasing the independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania—together or apart? The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania will come up with the final answer in our republic. I believe that the communists of the republic need to study carefully the proposals set forth in the appeal aimed at expanding the rights of republic communist parties, at creating a mechanism of relations between union and republic state and party organs which is new in principle. The path of confrontation, of peremptory decisions in the sphere of mutual relations with both the CPSU and various sociopolitical forces of the opposition is not a promising path; it is a dead end.

[Lashkevich] At present, an intensive influx of new blood into the ranks of party leadership is underway in the republic; leaders who have compromised themselves are being removed from party leadership in keeping with the will of the communists. Thus, in the course of past reports and elections, the names of secretaries of five city and rayon committees were not even placed on the ballot!

[Litvinas] This process is picking up steam. We badly need new ideas, new leaders who do not recognize the dogmatic canons of the past. Fortunately, the fashion of promoting to party leadership positions loud and vociferous economic managers has ended. At present, the party is beginning to originate an increasing number of perestroyka concepts, whereas as little as a year ago the initiative belonged to Sajudis, and we merely played catch-up being unable to clearly define our position and long-term goals.

It is important to understand that only a dialogue with various informal movements will allow us to remain the leading political force. In Lithuania, we understood this truth based on our own experience. It is time to learn how to listen to criticism quietly and offer criticism yourself using in the process the strength of arguments rather than the strength of your voice. At present, when our society is becoming politically polarized on a democratic basis, a dialogue is called for. People will understand who is telling the truth.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session

LD1512231289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1802 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Tallinn, 15 Dec (ETA-TASS)—Today, after a break, the session of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet continued its work. Draft laws of the Estonian SSR on trade unions, banks, "on procedures of utilizing environment and natural resources," "on the national rights of citizens of the Estonian SSR" in the first or second reading, and inquiries of the deputies of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet were on its agenda.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision to set up the Bank of Estonia as of 1 January 1990, the

Estonian law "on the national rights of citizens of the Estonian SSR," and a law on Estonian trade unions.

The deputies discussed the procedure on conducting elections for the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, the highest body of the republic, which will take place on 18 March 1990, and elected an electoral commission for elections to the Supreme Soviet.

The session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work at the end of December.

Ethnic Rights Law Adopted

LD1512214189 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Summary from poor reception] It was decided at today's Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session to set up the Bank of Estonia on 1 January 1990.

At its second reading, the law on Estonian SSR citizens' ethnic rights was adopted. Toomas Leito, chairman of the Commission on Ethnic Relations attached to the Supreme Soviet, says that this is but the first step in the elaboration of the law on cultural autonomy. As long as the latter does not exist, the law adopted today lays down certain rights of nationalities. "As far as the Estonian nation is concerned, the (?biggest) discussion and debate took place concerning the preamble which laid down—or to be more correct—lays down the right of the Estonian people to self-determination. This serves as a guarantee for free development of other peoples. And a number of people did not like this aspect; (?they) had even wanted it removed, but the vote decided that the clause remains as it was. I think that politically this is a [words indistinct] and very essential question. To my knowledge, this is the first time that there has been talk of the Estonian nation's right to self- determination within the Estonian legislation, which is so clearly worded.

The law on the natural environment and the use of natural resources was also adopted today.

Estonian Russian Deputies Justify Walkout

90UN0378A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 14 Nov 89 p 1

[Report on interview with Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Pavel Nikolayevich Panfilov by S. Sergeyev: "The 'For Equal Rights' Group Defends the Interests of the Minority, Says Its Chairman, Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Pavel Panfilov"]

[Text] **We are gradually becoming accustomed to a quite new parliamentary practice. Whereas previously those present at a session could not, to put it metaphorically, drop off to sleep and had to raise their hands at the proper time, now the debate on each issue requires in-depth knowledge of the subject, and competence. But not only this. A decision made by each deputy sometimes assumes both a sense of responsibility and a personal courage. This was the point of departure in our conversation with P. Panfilov.**

[Sergeyev] Pavel Nikolayevich, tell us how your group was created and who initiated it.

[Panfilov] Our group of deputies was created essentially by chance, although not for nothing. It was joined by Russian-speaking deputies from Narva, Kohhtla-Yarve, Sillamyae and Tallinn, and one deputy from Pyarnu also joined. We now number 60. Even before the creation of the group was officially announced—this happened only recently, on 10 November—the common interests of our electors helped in us banding together. At first this process took place spontaneously: We simply gathered to discuss particular issues in the lobbies, as they say. Then a group was formed to defend the opinion of the minority in the parliament, and this has now grown into the "For Equal Rights" group of deputies.

[Sergeyev] Are all the Russian-speaking deputies in your group?

[Panfilov] No, there are deputies from Valga and Tartu who do not participate in the work of our group.

[Sergeyev] Can you tell us what has already been done?

[Panfilov] Our aim is to resolve by parliamentary means those issues that affect the interests of the non-indigenous population. Because whether we like it or not the real situation is such that those interests are not always taken into account. This can be seen at almost meeting and in the discussion of virtually every draft law.

Moving by parliamentary means we submitted our own proposals regarding the draft Law on the Elections to the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. The first was a two-chamber system. Here, the chamber of nationalities should not be elected but made up of deputies of non-indigenous nationalities. In general a two-chamber system would enable the work of parliament to be altered in a very radical way in terms of work on draft legislation, and would guaranteed against a whole series of unnecessary factors and significantly lower interethnic friction. It would enable us to eliminate the possibility not in the adoption but in the preparation of draft laws that could harm someone, because that work makes no sense—a draft law that infringes on someone's rights or interests is simply doomed to become "impossible to pass." This means that it will satisfy everyone, that it is real and not some wordy search for compromise versions.

[Sergeyev] However, opponents of the two-chamber system claim that it is impossible since Estonia is not a federative state...

[Panfilov] But let us consider the reality; today it is that two major communities have been formed in Estonia. In our view, at this stage this kind of version would be useful. It is very probable that in five years or so the need for a two-chamber parliament will simply disappear, but at present this need does exist.

Our second proposal touches on the elections to the republic Supreme Soviet. Many people are not satisfied with the procedure now being proposed for counting the votes; it is very complicated and incomprehensible, and where there is complication and innovation there is also mistrust. Perhaps this kind of procedure is democratic and progressive but let us first test it at the elections to the local soviets of people's deputies, and if the people accept it then we can introduce it at a higher level.

As a legislative initiative we have submitted to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium two alternative sets of draft legislation—on citizenship of the Estonian SSR, and on immigration. These are very important and far from simple issues and we have all seen the kind of ambiguous response that occurred when the draft law on immigration was published.

There is one other special feature to our group—the large representation of workers. When we started our work within the present makeup of the Supreme Soviet we did not demand any special area of competence from anyone; the main thing was to raise one's hand at the proper time. But now the situation is quite different and we must think and analyze and have a good knowledge of the draft laws that are submitted, and be responsible both to ourselves and to the voters. We have therefore done a great deal to make our deputies truly competent, and to make them understand the essential nature of problems. Even before our group had been formed we had started to invite scholars, specialists, and experts in various fields to help us sort out issues and problems.

[Sergeyev] At one recent meeting during the 12th session your group walked out of the hall. Do you think that these kinds of parliamentary steps in the struggle are permissible?

[Panfilov] This is not a practice that we invented and it is used by various parliamentary groups in many democratic countries. I do not believe that it is ideal but in this specific instance it was our only response. Incidentally, we were not the first to resort to such a step. A legal assessment of the events of 1939-1940 in Estonia is essential and a commission made up of the best forces of our historical sciences worked well and you will now hardly find any people who will assert unconditionally that the decision of the Estonian State Duma was reached without any kind of pressure from the USSR army and government. The issue is complex, and in some particulars cannot be assessed unambiguously. But there was a revolutionary situation in Estonia! And so in the work it was necessary to rely not only on data from the archives available in Estonia but also to analyze many documents held in the archives in Moscow. In addition, we knew that the commission to assess these events, set up at the 1st Congress of USSR Deputies, was also working and that it would soon report its results and conclusions. It would probably been correct to thanks our councils of ministers for the enormous work that it did and to take its information under advisement. But the draft resolution of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet already contained appraised decisions, and this is something else again.

And there is another factor, namely, that the decisions of half a century ago were reached at government levels. We would like now just to wait for the results of the the investigation of this problem in the Union and in Estonia. We must be completely convinced in order to make such crucial decisions. Moreover, the danger does exist that this decision will signify pressure on the all-union commission.

[Sergeyev] Notwithstanding, you did walk out of the hall, but surely it would have been simple to abstain in the voting...

[Panfilov] We had submitted our own alternative draft decision to the session but it was immediately rejected. The fact is that virtually all our proposals are rejected because the majority of our parliament does not support them. We had no other way to draw attention to our problems, for we did represent the opinion if not of the absolute majority of the Russian-speaking population, then at least a significant proportion of it.

[Sergeyev] Pavel Nikolayevich, do you have the impression that the session might become almost endless? What is your prediction?

[Panfilov] I do have the feeling that it is going on for quite a long time. But this is the thing that is important. We are all saying "democracy, democracy." And here, in the example of our latest meetings, it can be seen that the road to democracy is very difficult, and that we must all learn— both our group of deputies and the entire parliament. Only by learning to work in a truly democratic spirit shall we be able to solve all issues successfully.

Latvian KGB Chief on Perestroyka, Security Issues

LD1812125189 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Riga December 18 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Valeriy Zaitsev and Yuriy Sizov:

Stanislav Zukul, chairman of the Latvian State Security Committee (KGB) has said the KGB's new task is to defend perestroyka.

The committee has already begun to rehabilitate Latvian residents who were subjected to repressions during the years of the Stalin personality cult, he told TASS.

At the same time he categorically rejected suggestions that there was no repressive state machinery during the years of bourgeois rule in Latvia from 1919 to 1940.

From 1919 to 1922 alone, he said, about 3,000 people were sentenced to death by courts-martial in Bourgeois Latvia or killed during so-called "escape attempts," he said.

The number of political trials grew from year to year. Data given in September 1936 by the British MANCHESTER GUARDIAN newspaper reveals that 20 people per 100,000 residents were imprisoned in Ireland, 30 in Britain, 50 in France, Norway and Denmark, 150 in Poland, 156 (excluding people in concentration camps) in Germany, and more than 200 people in Latvia.

The democratisation of Soviet society facilitates people-to-people contacts and promotes the development of "citizens diplomacy," Zukul said.

"We welcome this. But not everyone arrives in Latvia with good intentions," he emphasised.

For example, Juris Kaza, who lives in Stockholm, used tourist trips to Latvia in order to pass instructions to the leaders of ultra-radical nationalist informal associations.

In an article in the emigre newspaper BRIVA LATVIA (FREE LATVIA) on May 22, this year, he pointed out that it would be very important for the emigres now to resume or establish anew secret communications channels with the main movements in Latvia. As most often is the case, such activities go hand-in-hand with the gathering of espionage information.

On August 23, when visiting Latvia, Kaza, availing himself of connections with republican television personnel, penetrated a helicopter [as received] under an assumed name, and flew over and videofilmed territory closed to foreigners.

Peteris Elferts, a teacher at the Muenster Lettish School in the Federal Republic of Germany, who arrived in Riga in summer this year under a cultural contacts scheme, repeatedly visited closed areas and in one of them he took pictures of a guarded military facility.

He was warned that he was in an area closed to foreigners but he ignored the warning and refused to register at the Republican Interior Ministry's Department of Visas and Registrations.

In view of the fact that Kaza and Elferts flagrantly violated Soviet laws concerning the stay of foreigners in the Soviet Union, they are now denied entry into the USSR for a term of five years.

The Latvian KGB has specific information on the activity in Latvia of foreigners, connected with secret services. However, for understandable reasons, this data cannot be now made public, Zukul said.

Speaking of the possibility of the committee's cooperation with its Western counterparts, Zukul emphasised that cooperation may become a reality, primarily in the field of efforts to combat drug trafficking and terrorism.

He recalled that the staff of the Riga Customs Office, jointly with state security bodies, discovered 1,200 kilograms of hashish worth 22 million dollars in one transit cargo in 1988. The cargo and the documents were passed on to Interpol with a view to exposing international drug traffickers.

The republican KGB has submitted poposals to the Latvian Supreme Soviet on how to intensify efforts to combat organised crime, Zukul said.

This is a whole package of measures envisaging the elaboration and adoption of legal acts, the establishment of subdivisions for efforts to combat organised crime, their technical equipment and a number of other proposals.

Together with Latvian agencies of the Interior Ministry and the Procurator's Office, the KGB tries to expose criminal groups that perform violent acts or commit other crimes that do political damage to the state and to the personal interests of citizens.

New President for Latvian Academy of Sciences

LD2411042189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1516 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Riga, 23 Nov (TASS)—TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina reports:

Janis Lielpeteris, a 58-year-old physicist, was today elected president of the Academy of Sciences of Latvia (a republic in the Soviet Baltic region). He has become the sixth leader of that scientific center, which was set up in 1946 with assistance from scientists from other union republics. Bruno Purin, the previous president of the academy, had declared his desire to engage wholly in scientific research, and his request to resign was accepted. [passage omitted]

Belorussian Front Leader on 'Democratic Solidarity'

90UN0422A Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Nov 89 p 3

[Statement by Zenon Poznyak, chairman of the Board of the Belorussian People's Front, preceded by a commentary of the BELORUSSIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY: "Which Kind of Perestroyka Is at Issue?"]

[Text] In its 30 October issue, the Latvian newspaper ATMODA published a statement made at the Second Congress of the People's Front of Latvia by the chairman of the BNF [Belorussian People's Front] Board, Zenon Poznyak. In offering this text for the attention of the readers, we proceed from the fact that this is by no means a usual statement by an informal leader, but a speech which basically dwells on issues of a program, which expresses the political creed of the speaker himself and, apparently, of the movement he heads. If this is so, many issues of principle arise.

As is known, the word "perestroyka" is also written on the banners of the BNF. As its program says, the front itself was born "to organize extensive popular support for the radical changes in all spheres of public life initiated by the best forces of the CPSU..." However, at present the emphasis and conclusions drawn from Poznyak's pronouncements are different. It is not "the best forces of the CPSU" that have conceived and suffered for perestroyka anymore but "the liberal circle of the supreme party leadership." The policy of perestroyka itself is proclaimed to be a "duplicitous doctrine."

We hope that the reader will understand which kind of perestroyka Poznyak advocates—the kind the main directions of which were set forth at the 19th Party Conference, which the USSR Supreme Soviet is attempting to implement in the course of its complex, at times contradictory work, to which not only the best forces of the CPSU devote their energies but also all sober-minded people, or some kind of his own perestroyka invented by him in the course of "organizing extensive popular support?" If the latter is the case, then how does the BNF chairman imagine the future of our "common house," his hatred for which he is not even trying to conceal? What does he propose instead of the "common prison of nations" in any corner of which any man felt safe until recently, when ethnic aspirations began to grow into nationalist aspirations in some places not without the urging of certain forces? Should the things he is proposing be understood as the process of removing the political mask which as little as a year ago concealed his true goals and aspirations?

Let the reader judge for himself.

[Signed] The BELORUSSIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY

Dear friends, esteemed ladies and gentlemen!

I am happy to greet your highly esteemed congress on behalf of the Belorussian People's Front. We have many problems in common, and this is why I would like to set forth several considerations. The main issues which are facing the republics objectively are the issues of national renaissance and national independence. As little as 1.5 years ago, the situation was different. National renaissance was perceived as a component of the democratization of society, and sovereignty seemed quite within reach through the structural perestroyka of the USSR, the signing of a new union treaty on the basis of confederative links between free republics. However, time has passed, and it has become clear that no fundamental change in the function of the party superstate is in the cards. To the sound of perestroyka-oriented logomachy, antidemocratic laws are passed which are aimed at the reinforcement of the centralized authority, and the fate of republics is of no interest to anyone except them. The situation which has emerged is the result of political inconsistency, duplicity, and eclecticism of the perestroyka doctrine which was conceived in the liberal circle of the supreme party leadership as an emergency measure for saving the sinking ship of the Soviet party empire. The main thesis which unites at present the party liberals, party radicals and conservatives, and even a considerable segment of Russian democrats advocating perestroyka, is the thesis on the reinforcement of what they call "our common home," i.e., the unified party state of the USSR, our common prison of nations which is becoming our common coffin. Apparently proceeding from the "common house" thesis, the CPSU Central Committee proposed to adopt Russian as the state language in the USSR. Even Stalin did not bring himself to utter this reactionary statement aloud, but Gorbachev uttered and proposed this. Indeed, as one of the people's deputies said, it is difficult to be the leader of perestroyka and of nomenklatura at the same time. However, it is not the conformist great-power thesis on maintaining the common house and the centralized state by applying democratic patches that is progressive but the process of acquisition of freedom by the person and the resulting self-determination of peoples. The process of the breakup of the empire and formation of free states is progressive rather than the resuscitation and repair of the superpower. It became clear in the 4th year of perestroyka that Moscow is not interested in the actual salvation of peoples which are in a critical situation. Under the circumstances, secession from the USSR becomes the only hope for salvation so as not to perish together with the sinking ship. The issue is raised by life itself. However, the situation is tragic. The principle of non-economic organization of the Soviet economic system maintains the economic dependence of everyone so that its instant severing brings about a cataclysm which only a very courageous and very solidary people can bring itself to experience in order to survive. In the process, we need to grasp soberly that the West will hardly help. A transitional period of preparing for independence which is duly regulated from the legal and economic standpoints is necessary. On the way to freedom, democratic solidarity among the republics is necessary; it is necessary to grasp that the existence of a free Latvia is problematical without a democratic Belorussia. Political progress in the west of the USSR is unstable without the democratization of the Ukraine. Freedom is hard to secure alone and even among the three of you; however, it is actually possible in the process of developing democratization, creating an interrepublic common market, and democratic solidarity of all western republics of the USSR. Thank you.

Biography of Belorussian Party Secretary Kamay

90UN0256B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia Aleksey Stepanovich Kamay"]

[Text] Comrade A.S. Kamay was born in 1936. He is a Belorussian, a member of the CPSU since 1960. Higher education—he graduated from the Belorussian Agricultural Academy of the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School. He is a mechanical engineer by speciality.

He began his career in 1959 as a mechanic at the "Pisarevshchina" Sovkhoz of Mogilev Oblast's Mstislavskiy Rayon. He then worked as first secretary of the Mstislavskiy Raykom [rayon committee] of the Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], Komsomol organizer of the Mogilev Obkom [oblast committee] of the Belorussian Komsomol under the auspices of the Bobruysk Kolkhoz-Sovkhoz Production Administration, and secretary of this administration's Komsomol committee. In the period 1963-1968 he was chief engineer and chief of the Bobruyskiy Rayon Agriculture Production Administration. As of 1968 he was in party work—first secretary of the Krasnopolskiy and Bobruyskiy Raykoms and secretary of the Mogilev Obkom. As of 1979 he was head of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee's Agriculture Department. In 1982 he was elected chairman of the Executive Committee of the Gomel Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

As of April 1985 he was first secretary of the Gomel Obkom.

Comrade A.S. Kamay is a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and deputy of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. He has been awarded the Order of Lenin, three orders of the Labor Red Banner, the "Badge of Honor," and two medals.

Moldavian Ministers Released From Posts

LD1812161589 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 5 Dec 89 P 1

[Text] The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has released Comrade Vladimir Konstantinovich Kiktenko from his post as deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers in connection with his transfer to duties related to the elections.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Moldavian SSR has released Comrade Ivan Semyonovich Bolbat from his post as Moldavian SSR minister of transport and roads in connection with his retirement.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Moldavian SSR has released Comrade Stepan Ivanovich Loazan from his post as chairman of the Moldavian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting in connection with his retirement.

Ivashko Nominated for Ukrainian Supreme Soviet

LD1512141389 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1845 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] In a democratic atmosphere and with a wide exchange of views a conference of representatives of labor collectives for nominating candidates for deputies of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet from the industrial electoral district of Kiev was held at the "Bolshevik" Production Association.

As a result of open voting, Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, was nominated by an overwhelming vote in favor as candidate Ukrainian people's deputy from the industrial electoral district of Kiev.

Human Rights Meeting Held in Kiev 10 Dec

LD1112124889 Kiev in English to North America 0030 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Yesterday a meeting took place in Kiev under the slogan Human rights—law and reality. It was organized upon the initiative of the recently founded All-Ukrainian Society of the Oppressed People. Taking part in the meeting were representatives of almost all public associations and recently founded (?informal) movements as well as foreign guests.

The meeting was opened by the society's chairman, Yevhen Hrynyuk. He said:

Dear Kievates, dear guests, said the chairman. Yesterday there was a general meeting of our society. People gathered in Kiev from almost all the oblasts of the republic. They are people who lived through the tortures of the camps and prisons of the Stalinist times and the times of Brezhnev, Suslov, and Shcherbitskiy. We all gathered here so as to do everything we can to make impossible acts of arbitrariness in this country in the future. We would like to say that we, the entire humanity, entered the new age in mid-twentieth century, the age of law, freedom of speech, when wars, guns, nuclear weapons as the means for solving disputable issues have been universally condemned. All problems can and should be solved by the only means, that is by means of law, said Yevhen Hrynyuk.

Lvov Rally Commemorates National Liberation

LD1812125389 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Lvov—On 17 December a rally was held in Lvov by the "Memorial" organization with 10,000 people taking part.

The rally was to commemorate the national liberation movement in the 18th and 19th Centuries in the West Ukraine; the rally was also devoted to the memory of A. Sakharov.

Council Schedules Jan Lvov-Kiev 'Human Chain'

LD1812142489 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] The Ukraine, Kiev. On 16 December a sitting of the Greater Council of the Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] took place in Kiev. The election issue was discussed.

It has been decided to organize a human chain linking Lvov and Kiev on 21 January 1990. The human chain would mark the joining of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic by the West Ukraine in 1939.

Scientist Assesses Chernobyl Pollution Problem

LD1812124189 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Kiev December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondents Dmitriy Kiyanskiy and Aleksey Petrunya:

Viktor Baryakhtar, a head of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, stressed the need to create a system of specialised facilities to collect and process radioactive waste in the 30-kilometer zone around the Chernobyl nuclear power station, the site of a major accident in 1986.

"It's not a question whether or not to build the system," the scientist noted. "We can't do without it. The system must be built as soon as possible."

Baryakhtar said that the general radioactive background was considerably reduced due to the concentration of radioactive waste in the so-called temporary localisation sites (storing places) during the first stage of the clean up.

However, the 800 storing places were created in the midst of an emergency and do not correspond to the norm of radioactive safety. The problem of radioactive pollution spreading above the 30-kilometer zone still exists. The storing places provided only a temporary solution of the problem.

The creation of a system to process radioactive "dirt" in the 30-kilometer zone is the project under discussion, not the waste of nuclear power stations, the scientist stressed. Industrial activities in the zone should be minimised.

The All-Union Scientific Research and Design Institute of Power Engineering Technology in Leningrad was supposed to develop a project of the system construction.

However, the institute's technical and economic plans provoked serious objections of scientists, members of the commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The scientists object to the six years the institute has designated for the project's completion. The scientists believe that it must be completed within three years. It is a job that cannot be postponed.

This prompted republican scientists to reject the Leningrad project and demand that it be revised quickly.

Food Scarcity Reported in Azerbaijan

NC1912091489 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 17 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Will more provisions be available before the new year? All people in the republic are concerned with this matter. [Words indistinct] in the city's establishments which provide livelihood supplies. Those who travel to the market place frequently return emptyhanded. Despite the increasing prices, meat and [word indistinct] are (?scarce).

This situation is a result of the September strike by Azerbaijani railway workers, which disrupted the dispatch of products.

Is there any hope that the availability of provisions will improve by New Year's Eve? The republic's newspapers today published four interviews on the matter. Agasalim Bagirov, minister of trade; Zakir Abdullayev, chairman of the Union of Consumers Societies; (?Gembek) Kasumov, director of [words indistinct]; and Abbas Mamedov, chief of the Main Production Administration of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for Agro-Industry, replied to the questions put to them on the matter.

The interviews gave information on the measures taken to provide the republic with provisions by New Year's Eve.

Explosives Found in Azerbaijan Railway Car

NC1512130989 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 15 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Here is an AZERINFORM report:

Employees of the Administration for Internal Affairs in transportation, which is affiliated with the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs, experts from an engineering establishment in Baku, and a number of railway workers discovered [words indistinct] ammunition and various types of homemade explosives in a freight car loaded with construction materials, which were being sent to Stepanakert by the Artashat railway construction and maintenance administration in Armenia. (?Varsheli), deputy director of the USSR procuracy administration responsible for supervising law enforcement in transportation, traveled to the site of the discovery and told an AZERINFORM correspondent that the dispatch of weapons to Nagorno-Karabakh does not contribute to the efforts to establish peace in the region; on the contrary, it only inflames passions and worsens the situation.

The procuracy for transportation in the Azerbaijan SSR has launched a criminal investigation into the incident.

Additional Forces Sent to Armenian Border

NC1812085589 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The newspapers report that Alekperov, director of the Nazar Geydarov state farm [sovkhoz], and Aliyev, a driver at the sovkhoz, were killed and Mekhtiyev, director of [words indistinct], was (?seriously wounded) in Kubatlinskiy Rayon 2 weeks ago.

A group of employees from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Kubatlinskiy Rayon internal affairs department, headed by Mamedov, deputy minister of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs, traveled to the Armenian SSR to hold talks with the military commandant of Gorisskiy Rayon. The results of the investigation of the incident were to have been established during the talks.

AZERINFORM correspondent Mikhman Aliyev also traveled with the group. His report was published in today's newspapers.

Meanwhile, [words indistinct] Aydin Mamedov, Azerbaijan SSR minister of Internal Affairs, has disclosed that additional forces affiliated with the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs were sent to Kubatlinskiy and Lachinskiy Rayons yesterday to provide greater protection to the residents of Kubatlinskiy Rayon who live in villages close to the Armenian border.

Yerevan Reports on Incidents in NKAO

NC1512141389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1710 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] remains unchanged. The nighttime firing of shots, arson, and theft on interethnic grounds have unfortunately become a common feature in this part of the country. Incidents are taking place in all regions of the oblast.

The Kirkidzhan settlement at the edge of Stepanakert is notorious in this regard. Automatic and hunting rifles were fired from the Azerbaijani sector of the settlement on the night of 13-14 December. There were no casualties but a window in the home of citizen Arutunyan was shattered. An unidentified person bombed a [words indistinct] building in Hasanabat village of Askeranskiy Rayon at around 0130 on 14 December. As a result of the explosion, Armen Avetyan from the nearby village of Dashbulak was seriously wounded. The previous days too were turbulent. The homes of Mamedov, Babushev and Shirinov, prominent residents of Arachadzor village in Mardakertskiy Rayon, caught fire at the same time at 2210 on 11 December. Here too there were no casualties and the villagers put out the fire. Unidentified people infiltrated the dairy firm of the Mashtots collective farm on the night of 12-13 December and stole 15 heads cattle. A criminal investigation has been launched. The Stepanakert and pertinent rayon internal affairs departments are looking into the incidents.

As is obvious, today one can only dream about stabilizing the situation in the region. As before, the roads are blockaded. The Baku-Stepanakert passenger train is not running. Although it is true that freight cars carrying different goods for the national economy are arriving in the railway station of Stepanakert, these [word indistinct] gifts inspire no confidence because the people are well aware that the operation of the freight cars is directly connected with the policy of force being applied on Artsakh [NKAO] by Azerbaijan with the aim of [words indistinct] preventing a (?fundamental) solution to the NKAO problem.

In these complex times, the Armenian population of the NKAO believe that the utmost efforts must be made to implement the joint decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council on the reunification of Armenia and the NKAO. The future of the Armenian people rests only in the hands of the Armenian people themselves.

Iranian Railway Passengers Stranded in Baku

NC1812164289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] The workers of the Baku (?railway station) have recently apologized to Iranian passengers traveling from Moscow to Tehran. Their railway cars were not allowed into the [name indistinct] railway station. Instead, they were directed to Baku. Rustamov, who is first deputy director of the Azerbaijan railways administration, said:

The problem is that railway cars carrying tourists, diplomats, and businessmen were not allowed to travel to the Shvanidzor, Megri, and Karchevan section of the Azerbaijan railways network, which is in Armenian territory. Regrettably, this has frequently been observed lately.

Although the peaceful movement of freight cars has been restored, it cannot be said that this also applies to passenger trains. Problems have occurred when railway cars have begun to move not only toward the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] but also toward Armenia. Consequently, many passengers have been unable to travel to their original destinations.

The people of Megri in the neighboring republic have blockaded [words indistinct].

According to reports we have just received, a number of obstacles have been put up to obstruct the movement of trains which go via the Norashen railway station and enter Armenia. However, the situation has been observed to have stabilized as a result of the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the measures that are required to normalize the situation in the NKAO. Both sides must seek to establish joint measures.

Naturally, measures have been taken to see that the Iranians reach their country. It has been necessary to apply to [word indistinct] and send the train passengers to the Iranian border by a different route, that is, by the Baku-Astara route. But what can the [word indistinct]

Soviet passengers do? Is it necessary to send them to Nakhichevan, Yerevan, and other cities in the Transcaucasus via Iran?

Here is a report by AZERINFORM: The Azerbaijan railways administration has reported that the situation has changed at the present time. Passenger and freight cars on the tracks in the Shvanidzor, Megri, and Karchevan region have begun to move. The changes must be strengthened. The leading officials and local law enforcement organs in [word indistinct] rayon have a significant role to play in this task. The railway workers need their assistance to maintain uninterrupted transportation of passengers and (?delivery of freight) on the tracks.

People's Deputies Debate on NKAO Viewed

NC1512221189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] KOMMUNIST and BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY today published the reports they received from Afganov and Bazenov, their parliamentary correspondents, in Moscow. The efforts of the deputies from the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] to have the question of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] debated by the Congress of People's Deputies failed to achieve its objective. Afganov's report said:

Disregarding Gorbachev's objections, first Ilusyan and then Arutunyan and Ambartsumyan called on all the participants in the congress to help the poor, unhappy, and destitute Armenian people. As the deputies [word indistinct], a tense situation emerged. The meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet assigned the settlement of the NKAO problem to Azerbaijan SSR only 2 weeks ago. At a time when a ray of hope has emerged to improve the situation, the effort made to place the problem on the agenda of the congress through expressions of gloom could have undermined this hope. The chairman gave the floor to the deputies from the Azerbaijan SSR as well.

(?Khurshit) Ismaylov, Muslim Mamedov, and Ragib Dzhfarov, our deputies, foiled all the attempts made by the Armenian extremists by clearly outlining the true state of affairs. They declared that the objective of the Armenian deputies was to further worsen and increase the interethnic conflict, not remove the disputes. Had it been otherwise, the recent meeting of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet would not have passed a resolution intentionally aimed against the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereign rights. It is common knowledge that the people of Azerbaijan have regarded this (?treacherous resolution) as a hostile move.

The situation got so complicated that the people's deputies did not allow Yuriy Balayan, who more than anyone else bears the guilt of the tragic NKAO problem, to address the convocation, regardless of his shameless obstinacy. Meanwhile, disregarding the chairman's move to end the matter, Ilusyan and Arutunyan brazenly [word indistinct] the microphone. They obstructed the microphone. However, even their voices were unheard because of the loud objections in the meeting hall.

Ambartsumyan not only demanded the inclusion of the NKAO problem on the agenda but also the inclusion of the question of the blockade. The demand was unanimously rejected. However, the blockade of the railways was seriously criticized by all the deputies. Regardless of the information given by the representatives of Azerbaijan to the effect that the tracks are now open, the congress assigned the Supreme Soviet to deal with the question of the blockade. After the matter has been studied, it will be debated by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Azerbaijan Ideology Commission Holds Meeting

NC1512220289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] The Ideology Commission of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee has met under Ratib Zeynalov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. The participants in the meeting heard a report by Zeynalov on the ideological situation in the republic. The question of establishing a system to select, train, and educate capable individuals was discussed. The work carried out by the Ideology Department of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee with the representatives of scientific and creative intellectuals, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Trade Unions, the Azerbaijan SSR Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee, and the pertinent ministries and main administrations was noted. A decision was adopted on the matter that was discussed.

Meanwhile, the generally approved draft of the state program for the learning, teaching, and [word indistinct] of Azerbaijan's history was submitted to be debated again by the commission members, scholars, and experts.

An intensive exchange of views was held at the meeting on the restructuring of the party press organization in Azerbaijan SSR in the light of the decision adopted by the CPSU Central Committee on various matters relating to the restructuring of the central press organization. The participants in the meeting noted that the party's press organization in the republic should be used more extensively in the realization of the CPSU's policies. They also noted the importance of an active participation by the party's press organization in the implementation of the tasks relating to reconstruction.

The debates that were held during the meeting were addressed by Alibayev, Ryzhkov, [two names indistinct], and Makhmudov, who are the (?editors) of [words indistinct]; Nabiyev, who is the director of [words indistinct]; Ivanov, who is the editor of VYSHKA; and Shahmamedov, who is the editor of BAKU and [word indistinct].

The participants approved the Ideology Department's work plan for 1990. Ratib Aliyev, chief of the Ideology Department, took part in the work of the meeting.

Georgian Komsomol Plenum Criticized

90US0209B Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 26 Oct 89 p 1

[Text] A meeting of the Georgian Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Bureau, which studied the question "Violations Perpetrated From the Organizational Aspect at the Georgian LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Seventh Plenum," was held on 23 October this year. The issue was put to the bureau by Sesili Gogiberidze, first secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee.

It was observed that at the Seventh Plenum the exchange of opinions had taken place in a confidential and candid atmosphere and that problems of national and socioeconomic development and urgent questions of the youth organization had been discussed. The work of the plenum and its results had elicited attention and extensive comment from the republic's community. At the same time since the day the plenum ended to this day there has been incessant talk about its organizational aspect, competence and violation of the requirements of the instructions.

Following the plenum, some members of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee addressed a letter and verbal complaints to the Central Committee leadership. It was established from the results of a preliminary study of the question, unfortunately, that there really are grounds for such talk owing to the serious violations in the convening of members of the Central Committee, registration, the voting procedure and the work of the plenum in general. The serious mistakes which were made in the period of preparation for the plenum in the Tbilisi City, Adzhar Oblast and a number of other regional organizations were emphasized particularly.

The Georgian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau believes that a serious shadow was cast at the Georgian LKSM Central Committee Seventh Plenum at a critical moment of perestroyka and the democratization of public life, which is absolutely intolerable.

For the purpose of determination of the truth in the procedural and organizational questions of the holding of the plenum and its competence the bureau deemed it necessary to study with all due scrupulousness and objectivity all the facts associated with the abovementioned question.

The Georgian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau instructed the Tbilisi LKSM City Committee (Comrade T. Khvadadze), the Adzhar Komsomol Oblast Committee (Comrade M. Kidzinidze) and the assistant chief of the Red Banner Transcaucasus Military District for Komsomol Work (Comrade I. Kovalev) to study and examine the questions connected with the abovementioned violations. At the same time a special commission, which will study all the circumstances which led to the violations in the holding of the Georgian LKSM Central Committee Seventh Plenum, has been formed. The results will be reported to the Georgian LKSM Central Committee Bureau.

Comrade A.G. Dzhanelidze, deputy head of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational-Party and Cadre Work Department, and Comrade Sh.A. Dogonadze, head of the Division of Organizational and Statutory Questions and Unified Party Card of Organizational-Party and Cadre Work of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the work of the Georgian LKSM Central Committee Bureau.

Georgian Communist Group Independent of CPSU

90US0209A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 26 Oct 89 p 2

[Report on interview with Zurab Dzhaniashvili by E. Kakabadze: "Our Way"]

[Text] Yet another informal organization has appeared on the republic's political scene—the Georgian National Communist Alliance, whose constituent assembly was held on 25 April 1989. The 50-year-old oriental scholar Zurab Dzhaniashvili, former member of the CPSU, has been elected chairman of the coordinating council.

Today he answers questions put by MOLODEZH GRUZII.

[Kakabadze] Introduce your organization, if you will, and its aims and tasks.

[Dzhaniashvili] Before we begin our discussion, I would like to make the following statement. It concerns the so-called "what if." Many people are today at the crossroads and are hesitating, what if the dark times should return. I would like to state with all due responsibility in this connection: Should the dark times in truth return, there are no guarantees that, like the plague, they will spare some people, regardless of position and rank, age and sex, nationality and educational level. For this reason we must all together struggle to ensure that they never return. We need to make haste and stand shoulder to shoulder to ensure that the black death not swallow up all without exception. We have already had bitter lessons of this, and for this reason I appeal to you—people—be people!

[Kakabadze] Now that the statement has been made, let us return to the first question.

[Dzhaniashvili] The current situation in the republic has posed the question of the need for struggle for national independence. The national liberation movement in Georgia is today a reality. This movement is supported by Georgian communists also. It could not be otherwise inasmuch as the majority of them are true patriots of their motherland. But they have hitherto been unable to display their national feelings and are experiencing a certain confusion and hesitation in determination of their mission.

And so in order to enlist in the national movement a vast army of communists it was decided to form a political organization, but one that was qualitatively new and which would have nothing in common with the Georgian Communist Party. There thus arose the Georgian National Communist Alliance, which is an independent organization struggling for national ideals.

Our priority task at the initial stage of our existence is to draw up basic program documents persuading all Georgian communists of the need to leave the CPSU and unite in the National Alliance, which is shortly to be a powerful political organization endowed with all legal rights. The alliance will contribute to the peaceful development of the national movement and the establishment of an alliance of the middle intelligentsia, workers and peasants in order to avoid possible antagonism between different strata of the population and ultimately civil war, the prerequisites for which are to hand.

The alliance's program contains the following basic points: the winning of Georgia's complete political and economic independence; recognition of a multiparty system; legalization of private property; transfer of the land to the peasants for permanent use; decentralization and denationalization of the main industrial facilities; guarantees of protection of the individual and observance of human rights; equality of people of all nationalities living in Georgia; legalization of Georgian as the official language; creation of a national bank and army; total abolition of all censorship; and so forth.

The state system of an independent Georgia will be built on the basis of democratic elections, and Soviet Russia (in the event of restoration of such a state) will be recognized within the framework of a league of a commonwealth of nations by analogy with Great Britain, with observance of the principles of equality.

We set forth all this, only in more detail and more comprehensively, in the first issue of our organ—the newspaper NATLISVETI—which appeared in an edition of 3,000 copies.

[Kakabadze] It could be inferred from your words that you are attempting to create a communist opposition to the Communist Party and, calling yourselves communists, under conditions where the authority of the governing party has declined markedly among the people, that you are hoping for the sympathies of the masses at large. Is this not utopian?

[Dzhaniashvili] We are certain that it is not. We do not shun the title of communist since "communist" in its pure, original meaning expressed an aspiration to the achievement of the well-being of the people and only the people, but was defiled by unworthy people. We want to cleanse this title of its badness and resurrect it, and the people must understand this. We hope that our alliance will day by day win ever increasing authority and the people's trust, and everyone must be persuaded that this is a strong organization based on sound scientific ideology which will have the powers to create the state system of an independent Georgia and administer it as befits a progressive country.

[Kakabadze] Forgive me, but the governing Communist Party has the same aspirations as those about which you have just now been speaking—gaining authority and the people's trust and completing the restructuring of political and economic life which has begun. Would it not be nobler for you communists, since this is what you call yourselves, to join in this process?

[Dzhaniashvili] No, and once again, no. I have already said that we do not wish to have anything in common with the Communist Party, the more so in that Georgia does not have its own communist party. That which exists is a party wholly and fully dependent on the CPSU and which lacks not only independence but its own program, rules, philosophy.

[Kakabadze] But communists, wherever they have formed their organizations, have a single philosophy and ideology—Marxism-Leninism.

[Dzhaniashvili] I do not dispute this. We are not renouncing Marxism but it first has to be considerably revised. I shall continue this thought.

Proceeding from the Georgian Communist Party's total dependence on the CPSU, it cannot take any fundamental independent steps running counter to general party policy of the center. In addition, we cannot expect of the Georgian Communist Party, as of the CPSU, any serious actions if only because there is much that they like in the current situation, primarily the usurpation of power. I do not believe that genuine democracy—the fundamental basis of a civilized world—is attainable under a one-party system. When one sole party is established by law in a country, this party becomes an OGPU [Joint State Political Administration], which we have witnessed. Gorbachev says that the one-party system evolved in our country historically. I would like to take issue: With what historical period is he starting, with Ivan the Terrible or with the 1920's, when the Bolsheviks eliminated the 19 parties which existed in Russia? A monopoly on power leads to no good, and the CPSU should have understood its political bankruptcy in 70 years of leadership of the country and have eliminated itself, as has been the case in Hungary. The sole thing that the governing party has recognized as yet is that a situation had come about wherein revolution from below was possible and for this reason hastily began it from the top, announcing perestroyka. But even perestroyka, which has gone on for 4 years now, has failed to produce the desired results, other than routine disenchantment with the party's capacity for remaining in power.

We will not get anywhere with palliative measures and a cosmetic overhaul of the existing system. What is needed are fundamental measures, otherwise the appearance of new Pugachev's and Razin's cannot be ruled out.

[Kakabadze] Do you believe it possible to earn political dividends by discrediting the governing party. As far as can be seen from your press organ, you are sparing no black paint for this.

[Dzhaniashvili] We believe that the people should see things not in an embellished but in the real light.

[Kakabadze] Very well. You have acquainted us with the alliance's strategy. Tell us about its tactics.

[Dzhaniashvili] Our main aim is to dispel the myth of the "uniqueness and inimitability" of the CPSU and pull out if only one brick from the monolithic wall which calls itself the Communist Party. The methods? Persuasion, the winning of people who support us. We will strive for the holding of truly democratic elections and try to enter parliament. Our alliance makes of paramount importance in its activity the achievement of good things for the ordinary individual. Believe me, our people deserve to live in a human fashion. They have acquired real power and have come to believe in it and will no longer submissively await grace and favor.

TASS Notes 18 Dec Kirghiz Earthquake

LD1912080989 Moscow TASS in English 0803 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Frunze December 19 TASS—An earthquake with a magnitude of six points at the epicentre occured at 16.32, Moscow time [1332 GMT], on December 18 at the border between the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and China.

According to the Seismology Institute of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences, the focus of the earthquake was 130 kilometres south-east of the town of Osh.

Earth tremors were also felt in Gulcha and Sufi-Kurgan villages at 3-4 points and in the towns of Osh and Uzgen—at about three points.

According to preliminary data, there was no loss of life or damage.

Party 'Zeal' in Suppressing Frunze Critics Described

PM1512093189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent G. Shipitko report under the "Follow-up" rubric: "People's Reaction to What We Say"]

[Text] Passions in the city were on the boil for almost a month following the city party committee [gorkom] bureau decision to dismiss V. Zapolskiy, deputy editor of the newspaper VECHERNIY FRUNZE. The actual conflict was reported by our newspaper (IZVESTIYA No 306) in the article "Strongarm Pressure." But what happened afterward?

Let us look at the newspaper VECHERNIY FRUNZE. Journalists working on the city's popular publication strove to efficiently and honestly report current events in their articles. But this work style did not always meet with the city bosses' understanding. Anyone could see that the different attitudes to the proclaimed principle of glasnost could not fail to end in conflict.

A gorkom bureau sitting at the end of October passed a decision to relieve the deputy editor of office, perceiving him as the culprit behind the current confrontation between the party committee and the editorial office. And in order to prevent any further free-thinking, the same decision appointed to the editorial collegium people who were hardly versed in journalism but were devoted to the "gorkom line." An unprecedented case in the history of Soviet journalism. The journalists said a resounding "no" to such tyranny. Consequently the bureau was forced to suspend its decision and V. Zapolskiy was able to get on with his job. Temporarily, until such time as a party gorkom plenum made its own decision.

Intensive preparations were made for the plenum, and it opened with an angry condemnation of the journalists. And not just of VECHERNIY FRUNZE journalists. The other mass media, including the central press, got the treatment at the same time. Demands could be heard: "Either they uphold our party positions or we will have to go our separate ways. There is no alternative." It was claimed, of course, "that today's discussion of the question of the editorial office's work is a vivid demonstration of democracy, of the party's glasnost line."

The outcome was that the plenum unanimously ratified the bureau decision, and accordingly journalist V. Zapolskiy found himself without a job. At the same time they determined to teach all those who had defended him a lesson. A convenient pretext was found: The silent protest by journalists and their supporters from among the city's residents outside the building where the plenum was being held was classed as an unauthorized rally.

The eight most active participants in the protest action were summoned before an investigator and later before a court. It was decided to give them a warning on this first occasion. True enough, this lenient decision was preceded by lengthy arguments: How to define the actions of the people who had gathered outside the Political Enlightenment House—a rally, a demonstration, or a picket? The judge gave a true judgment of Solomon, describing the event as "a demonstration of people's opinion."

"Trivia" like the protocols drawn up a few days after the incident and the identification of "persons in breach of public peace" from photographs were discounted altogether. There were also extraordinary occurrences. Someone who had not been present at the "demonstration of people's opinion" was summoned to the court. He had been "fingered" through his signature on the document...

Unfortunately, the "Frunze syndrome" of administrative zeal is not an isolated case. Things like this are happening in many of the country's regions. Yes, life today shows that conflicts between publishers and editorial offices are inevitable. But the opinion of readers and viewers must always be taken into account. If VECHERNIY FRUNZE were to be appraised from these positions, the readers have had their say by supporting the newspaper articles for which the party gorkom is now blaming it.

Kirghiz MVD Comments on Tokmak, Kara-Balta Riots

90US0226B Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA in Russian 28 Oct 89 p 4

[Communique by the Press Center of the Kirghiz SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: "According to Rumors and on Good Authority"]

[Text] Recent mass incidents with the participation of young people in the cities of Tokmak and Kara-Balta have caused much talk. Rumors were exaggerated to the effect that curfew was supposedly imposed there, and streets were patrolled by reinforced militia and internal troops details.

In conjunction with this, we are releasing an official report on the events that occurred in Kara-Balta and Tokmak.

However, first of all we should recall that curfew is introduced in particular cases by a special resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the republic, and in the event it is adopted, this is immediately communicated through the mass media. In this case, curfew was not introduced in either Tokmak or Kara-Balta.

Therefore, what happened in these cities?

This is what the operations sections of the ministry reported to the press center. On 10 October citizens let the operations section of the city internal affairs department in Tokmak know that a fight between the young people of the city and the village of Menetkech in Chuyskiy Rayon was set for the evening hours. The internal affairs departments of these localities put together on short notice plans for joint actions aimed at preventing the eventual incidence of hooliganism. Soviet and party organs were informed about the forthcoming disturbances.

Approximately at 2000, groups of young people began to assemble in No 1 microrayon of the city. Soon there were about 100 young people there. Somewhat fewer, about 70 people, gathered in the village of Menetkech.

Violations of public order were successfully avoided due to the vigorous explanatory work and the localization of the sites of a possible incident or conflict skillfully organized by the militia. In the following several days, work on suppressing eventual conflicts was performed in the city by the Special Missions Militia Detachment (OMON) of the republic MVD. At present the situation is stable.

As far as the events in Kara-Balta are concerned, they developed in keeping with a somewhat different scenario. A youth discotheque was held on 18 October at 1930 in the dormitory of technical vocational school No 105. About 200 residents of the city and youths from nearby villages were present at the discotheque. During the dance a quarrel between the students and the "guests" occurred. District militia inspector E. Abdrakhimov, who was present at the discotheque, attempted to stop the quarrel that broke out. However, the situation got out of control, and it continued to deteriorate. The district inspector called in additional forces through the operations section in order to restore public order. The leadership of the city department headed by its chief L. Cherepov, militia employees, and members of volunteer detachments urgently went to the site of the incident.

The bulk of those gathered did not respond to the proposals by the militia to disperse, and attempted to penetrate into the compound of the school, having armed themselves with sticks and stones.

The militia chief made the only correct decision: The order was given to fire several warning shots into the air from a pistol and an automatic rifle. This cooled off the participants in the incident, and the bulk of the young people dispersed immediately. Fifty people, mainly from the village, were delivered to the precinct center where the leadership of the department of internal affairs had a conversation with them.

Two students of the vocational technical school were slightly injured during the conflict by the stones thrown. There were no injuries among militia employees and members of volunteer detachments.

In this instance, as well as in Tokmak, preventive measures were taken and instigators of the conflict were revealed by the OMON forces over several days.

Incidentally, it was apparently the unusual dress of the OMON employees (black overalls and berets), their weapons and equipment—automatic rifles, rubber sticks, bulletproof vests, and handcuffs at the belt—that confused the residents of these cities, and they interpreted this as a clear sign of the introduction of emergency measures.

Many readers are interested to know whether there were nationalist manifestations during the conflict. The answer is unambiguous: There were no clearly manifested excesses with a nationalist "savor." As a rule, the groups of young people were interethnic.

By now, the operative situation in these cities is completely back to normal. The units of the Special Missions Detachment have returned to their permanent post.

Niyazov Addresses Turkmen Workers

LD2411125789 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1655 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Comrade Niyazov today met with workers of the Gasan-Kuli settlement, who had expressed concern at the current state of affairs in connection with the abolition of Gasan-Kuli Rayon. The settlement's inhabitants had complained in particular of the unsatisfactory housing provisions, the low level of municipal services, and the difficulties which have arisen with employing the population.

Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [TuSSR] KGB Chairman Arkhipov, Lieutenant General Korobeynikov, commander of the Red Banner Central Asian Border District, and Mogilevets, first deputy chairman of the TuSSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Agro-industrial Committee, who spoke at the meeting, told of the measures which will be taken to raise the people's living standard. In particular, a decision is now being drawn up regarding the construction of the Kazandzhik-Kizyl-Atrek-Gasan-Kuli water supply to the region's remote settlements. It was stressed that more coordination, organization, and order are important for raising people's well-being.

The meeting was addressed by Comrade Niyazov. He told of the progress of perestroyka in the republic, as a result of which qualitative changes are taking place in the economic and social spheres of life, of how the election campaign is proceeding, which will further the acceleration of activity by local government organs and the strengthening of interethnic relations, and noted that at this crucial time there is no more important task than speeding up the process of renewal. Each communist and worker of the republic must take part in its implementation. Only after becoming the business of the whole people can perestroyka be successful. That is why it is necessary today to act with initiative, persistently, vigorously, and with a high sense of responsibility.

The first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee reported that the decision had been made to form Gasan-Kuli Rayon. This report was welcomed with great approval. [passage omitted]

Lukyanov Assesses Supreme Soviet Session

90UN0404A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Report on interview with A.I. Lukyanov by O. Losoto and A. Chernyak: "Step Toward the Power of the People"]

[Text] [Losoto, Chernyak] The USSR Supreme Soviet Second Session has concluded. Opening it, M.S. Gorbachev said that the motto of the session should be practical efficiency. Was this wish justified? How would you evaluate the results of the work done by the Soviet Parliament?

[Lukyanov] I would not be sinning before the truth, I believe, were I to say that the session just held was considerably more efficient than the preceding one. In my view, we have begun to approach the problems which the Supreme Soviet has to resolve in a far more professional, skilled and profound manner and have begun to handle the time more solicitously and intelligently. I would mention that there were 34 items on the agenda. With a few exceptions, well, to be precise, 29 were examined. In addition, 20 new ones dictated by practice and requiring a prompt response were added to them.

At the same time I have to say plainly that our "old acquaintance"—the parliamentary talking-shop with its characteristic attributes: Empty declarations, improvisation at the microphone and attempts to flirt with the electorate made itself known, as before. Such splashes and deviations repeatedly led the Supreme Soviet astray and deformed the content and thrust of the debate. This suited some people, possibly, and perhaps some people are impressed by this style of behavior, but no one any longer thrills to it and loses his head because of it today. This is said by the quite strident critical telegrams received in the Kremlin following each session shown on television.

[Losoto, Chernyak] What was the reason for the large amount of legislative work heaped on the shoulders of the USSR Supreme Soviet Second Session?

[Lukyanov] There were several reasons. Primarily an understanding of the need for changes and a desire to accomplish them in the spirit of the demands of the times—the turnabout of the economy in the direction of man. It was essential to also carry out the commissions of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies aimed at a decisive restructuring of society's economic and social life. Finally, people's demands, the breath of strikes, the fury of mass meetings and the beating of the country's pulse are becoming increasingly palpable in the Kremlin and the committee and commission meeting rooms. The temperature in society is elevated. The Supreme Soviet cannot fail to sense the intensity of public emotions. And under these conditions legislative practice should not simply follow events but anticipate and contribute to a reduction in social tension and is called on step by step to create an interconnected system of democratic laws guaranteeing our state's dependable functioning.

It is not easy, as Academician Shatalin observed in PRAVDA recently, becoming the most "lawful" country in two months. Nonetheless, much was done in this time. A number of important laws and decrees was passed. I shall not enumerate them. They are known to the readers. A number of draft laws is being submitted for examination by the second congress of people's deputies, others, for nationwide discussion.

The situation which has taken shape in certain areas of economic and social life required of the session appreciable correctives. Such an urgent question as regulating the trading and purchasing activity of the cooperatives and regulating the price of goods and services was examined beyond the confirmed agenda. A decree was adopted on additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and intensify state price control. Urgent measures were confirmed for ensuring the uninterrupted functioning of railroad transport and the base sectors of the economy. The declaration on the complete political rehabilitation of the peoples subjected to forcible resettlement and other decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet evoked good comments in society.

Of course, not all the documents mentioned here are of equal significance. Take the draft law on leave or the draft law on pensions, which have been submitted for nationwide discussion and which represent nothing other than a radical reform of the system of leave and pensions which is in effect in our society.

As a whole, I believe that the deputies have left the completed session better armed with knowledge, more experienced and more organized.

If we take as the reference point the First Congress of People's Deputies, then, returning to the Leninist concept of the power of the people, we have covered a considerable stretch of the way. The congress and the two sessions of the Supreme Soviet were real instruments of the exercise of the people's wishes. This fact is of all the more political importance in that it is a question in principle of a fundamental restructuring not of individual parts but of the entire mechanism of power, administration and control.

[Losoto, Chernyak] A great deal of work is being performed by the people's deputies outside of the Kremlin walls, as they say: In the committees and standing commissions of the chambers and in various organizations and establishments. Many active, competent members of parliament have come onto the scene of state activity. What is your opinion in this connection?

[Lukyanov] Even had there been no such question forthcoming from PRAVDA, I would have tried in two words to touch on this problem. Why? Because I consider a most significant and most notable phenomenon of our public life the emergence on the political scene of a new generation of state-minded people. As first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it is, evidently, not all that convenient for me to name specific names but, believe me, there are people whose opinion and whose approach to this problem or the other are of interest to me additionally as a lawyer also and who are simply humanly close. Largely thanks to their efforts and understanding of the problems, we are finding solutions to knots which are tied quite tightly at times.

At the same time, however, I am far from thinking of dividing the deputies into "first" and "second" class. The openness of the work of the Supreme Soviet and the activity of the standing commissions of the chambers and the committees afford extensive opportunities for ensuring that each of them reveal to the maximum possible extent his knowledge, experience and professionalism in the state field. I am sure that we will many times come to see in the best light both those who are members of the Supreme Soviet today and those to come in the future.

Let us, however, return to the start of the question. Whereas the first steps of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the Supreme Soviet were exploratory, in the main, in the sense of the formation of organizational forms included, there is every reason today to speak of the very appreciable potential opportunities of these bodies for realization of the powers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I would recall that 928 persons, including 238 members of the Soviet of the Union, 235 members of the Soviet of Nationalities and 455 USSR people's deputies, have been elected to the commissions and committees. We see approximately the same ratio in each committee and commission, which include, as a rule, representatives of all the union republics. It is here that all the preliminary analytical and expert work on the preparation of questions for examination at Supreme Soviet sessions is concentrated. Articles of laws and wording are polished, new ideas and approaches are "run in" and alternative drafts and decisions are tested. Although this work remains out of the frame, as a rule, it has to be said that the deputies are approaching it with increasingly great responsibility.

Whereas initially the legislators and the ministries were divided by a barrier of a certain mistrust and suspicion, now, it seems to me, normal, businesslike contacts are being established, on the basis of principle, what is more, which is making it possible to evaluate this problem or the other in a more skilled and comprehensive manner. These new qualities were manifested graphically, for example, during the preparation of such most intricate documents as the draft plan and budget for 1990, when fruitful cooperation was established between the legislative body and the government.

As a whole, approximately 350 sittings on the most diverse issues were conducted by the committees and commissions during the session. And this experience will be perfected, of course.

We sometimes hear the rebuke: The commissions and committees have studied this question or the other insufficiently, and the Supreme Soviet is forced to send the document back for additional work. It seems to me that this is normal and testifies, aside from all else, to the fact that the highest organ of power is not "swallowing whole" half-finished projects but trying itself to carefully go into everything and endeavoring to grasp everything better. Things can only benefit from this. I believe that were each document from the depths of the commissions and committees to automatically get good marks, we would not avoid mistakes. Only thorough critical study rendered many bills and decisions acceptable. At the same time the committees or commissions have frequently, at the preliminary study stage even, failed to agree with a proposed draft. There have been periods when, following examination in the Supreme Soviet, 10-15 draft laws and decrees have been undergoing additional work simultaneously. I see nothing reprehensible in this. Last-minute rushed work leads to no good in any instance, in legislation even less.

Such a new trend in the work of the committees and commissions as the rapid increase in the number of control questions which they examine is exceptionally important and valuable. There are many of them, and the issues are various, but they are all connected with the topic of the day and the requirements of people's life. Consequently, the Supreme Soviet is increasingly mastering not only its legislative and administrative functions, but also the functions of supreme control.

And concerning one further essential aspect of the work of the committees and commissions. Meetings with the leaders of ministries and departments, scientists and representatives of public organizations are held here. Permanent reception of the citizens is organized here. A tremendous number of letters and telegrams is received. So they have quite a substantial body of concerns. The Supreme Soviet Secretariat, which is called on to service these bodies, needs to enhance the level of support for the legal, organizational and technical aspects of this work. It is not always that this is done, it is true.

[Losoto, Chernyak] PRAVDA readers are noting that sharp, protracted debate sometimes erupts in the Supreme Soviet meeting hall at the time of the discussion of various issues. The opinion that the heart of the problem is sometimes drowned out in this debate is being expressed....

[Lukyanov] In my view, there can be no truly representative organ of power without debate, for this would no longer be a representative body but something different. Debate helps us see more clearly the strong and weak aspects of a bill or other document and some phenomenon, concept, or personality even. It is important only not to turn an argument and exchange of opinions into a "dispute of the deaf," abuse and label-pinning, but this still happens with us, unfortunately. We are learning to recognize our mistakes and learning to look for compromises and not bring matters to the point of confrontation.

From time to time it sometimes seems to some people in the meeting hall important to express this instructive maxim or the other on the practice of bourgeois parliaments. It would be stupid to brush aside their experience. But it is far more important for us, in my opinion, to carefully preserve and develop the good traditions of the Leninist congresses of the soviets of worker and peasant deputies and working people's deputies conversant with life not by hearsay and knowing how to appreciate words and deeds and time. A spirit of free debate predominates in our Supreme Soviet today. No one can say that attempts are being made to rein it in. But freedom of debate does not, unfortunately, guarantee its high quality.

We are receiving letters whose authors are incensed that certain deputies are concerned not so much with a search for practicable ways to solve specific questions as with a desire to create a nervous atmosphere. The letters frequently ask the following question: When will deputies (approximately a dozen names are cited) cease pontificating solely in the name of the people? As one journalist observed, the people hardly have time to reflect before a speaker is unerringly divining their innermost thoughts and immediately communicating them, and in categorical form, what is more: "The people demand!" "The people want!" "The people will not understand!" "The people will hold to account!" What can we say here? The writers of the letters are right, as is the television viewer, who, to put it mildly, is amazed at such arrogance and who is keeping quite a zealous eye on how the Soviet Parliament is changing from a seething debating club into a genuine legislative body.

I shall emphasize once again: I have considered and continue to consider that a search for the truth is inconceivable without honest and high-minded dialogue and without a comparison of viewpoints. The way toward consolidation lies not in a winding down of debate, but in the selection of the doctrines, ideas, and concepts which correspond to the realities of the present state and prospects of the development of our society and which are capable of advancing the cause of perestroyka and renewal.

[Losoto, Chernyak] We have the experience of the election of USSR people's deputies this March. Proceeding from this, what do you wish for both the electorate and the candidates for deputy at the impending elections to the republic and local soviets?

[Lukyanov] The March election campaign was an important page in our political history. We saw for the first time, perhaps, that a real election struggle cannot be without victors and vanquished. There was much else that we saw for the first time also: The nomination of alternative candidates, an awakened taste for debate and the real possibility of choice. It seems to me that we have yet to duly appreciate one further notable phenomenon from the standpoint of the establishment in society of a democratic atmosphere: The elections permitted all of us voters to sense far more keenly our civic responsibility.

Until recently the problem of the popularity of politicians—on the scale of the country or a small city—existed independently, as it were. To some of these figures the electorate's opinion of them was of little consequence inasmuch as this opinion was unable to operate to full effect.

Perestroyka has invaded this zone most decisively. Today, when positions, characters, and viewpoints clash in open political struggle and debate, it becomes clear who is who, in the body of people's deputies included.

Of course, the defeat at the last elections of certain party officials and industrial managers was not a tragedy for the electorate and did not undermine their faith in perestroyka. In addition, defeat was sustained, as a rule, by those who were responsible for difficult socially and economically significant areas of work reflected in the life of literally every family. On the other hand, it is known also that some of the victorious candidates for deputy built their tactics exclusively on critical material and indictments of the bureaucratic system, and any criticism of themselves or attempt to clarify a position were immediately declared apparatus games and suppression of democracy. Nor did these phenomena escape the field of vision of the electorate. For this reason I believe that in the course of the impending elections to the republic and local organs of power the level of understanding and evaluation of the candidates' platforms will be more profound and politically more sober. It is also perfectly clear to me that there will be no decline in the demand for outstanding people with their own view of the processes occurring in society and with their own understanding of problems and ways of solving them. I am sure that it will today be more difficult than yesterday for demagogues and for those who are generous in promises, who flirt with the electorate and who will go to any lengths for the sake of the telling phrase. I believe that at the coming elections the party organizations, the unions and the workforce will operate far more assertively than at the past elections.

I would, on the other hand, like to hope for all of us that, first, the people's deputy become a key figure of any soviet and, second, that he adopt a firm social and political platform reflecting the reality of our life and struggle skillfully for people's interests and for the socialist ideals of perestroyka.

[Losoto, Chernyak] Readers are inquiring how the Supreme Soviet's foreign policy relations are developing. What is its influence on the processes of mutual understanding and cooperation which are taking place in the world?

[Lukyanov] I should mention primarily that the restructuring of the USSR Supreme Soviet could not have failed to have been reflected in such an important sphere of its activity as the Soviet state's foreign policy. In accordance with the instruction of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, a system of effective parliamentary supervision of the elaboration and implementation of the foreign policy course of the Soviet state in the spirit of the new political thinking is being established. Information was received for the first time in many years from the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the results of his visits to Great Britain, the FRG and France and on his participation in the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. Parliament also heard for the first time the account of the USSR foreign minister on the work of the department he heads in the period since April 1985. Such accounts will continue to be practiced.

A most important component of the new parliamentary mechanism, which is intended to exclude the nondemocratic, secret adoption of foreign policy decisions of vital importance to our country, is the Committee for International Affairs which has been formed by the Supreme Soviet.

There is growing significance under the conditions of perestroyka in direct contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and foreign members of parliament. These contacts are actively contributing to the establishment of new political thinking in the practice of international relations and creating real opportunities for a joint search for mutually acceptable solutions of urgent problems of the present day. As a whole, the international activity of the renewed Supreme Soviet and its bodies is designed to actively contribute to the formation and implementation of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course, the further consolidation of our country's international positions and the creation of propitious conditions for the solution of urgent domestic policy problems.

[Losoto, Chernyak] Our new parliament has gotten onto a working track. Ahead lies the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. How do you evaluate the present stage of Soviet parliamentarianism?

[Lukyanov] To put it briefly, the Supreme Soviet has surmounted the difficulties which were inevitable for the initial stage of the work and is entering the phase of maturity.

[Losoto, Chernyak] In what is this manifested?

[Lukyanov] First, we are incrementally obtaining increasingly new evidence that our supreme organ of power is capable of tackling the most crucial and complex tasks on a broad democratic basis. It is showing its efficiency in practice.

Second, ever increasing competence and professionalism are being manifested in its work. Experience is coming, and the deputies are acquiring the skills of legislative and control work. Mass-meeting approaches in the discussion of questions are disappearing. The fruitfulness of the discussions is growing.

Third, the forms of work of the USSR Supreme Soviet are being perfected. Specifically, the center of gravity in the work on bills and other issues is shifting, as contemplated by the reform of the political system and as we have mentioned, to the Supreme Soviet committees and the commissions of its chambers.

It may be said, as a whole, that the USSR Supreme Soviet is by its activity increasingly actively laying the foundations of the socialist law-based state, increasingly consistently implementing the principles of socialist democracy, confirming its profound allegiance to perestroyka and consolidating the guarantees of its irreversibility. Naturally, its activity reflects the trends and contradictions typical of the present stage of perestroyka.

While noting all that is positive which is enriching the work of the country's highest representative body we are not, of course, closing our eyes to the shortcomings and the symptoms of parliamentary disease about which M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the conclusion of the USSR Supreme Soviet First Session. We have not, unfortunately, rid ourselves of them completely.

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies is not that far off. New steps will have to be taken to convert the political and economic reforms from the sphere of ideas into legislative and organizational realities. I have no doubt that the parliamentary December will be a hot one.

Burlatskiy on Objectives of Deputies' Club

PM2111142889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Miroslav Buzhkevich report on interview with USSR People's Deputy F. Burlatskiy under the rubric "Political Diary": "People's Deputies' Club"—date, place of interview not stated]

[Text] This piece of news probably interested many readers—the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium gave its support to a proposal from a number of members of the committees for international affairs and questions of legislation, legality, and law and order on the formation of a USSR people's deputies' club at our parliament. How did the idea arise? What will the club concern itself with, and in what way? These and other questions are asked by many people who have telephoned the editorial office. Here is what I was told by one of the originators of the initiative, USSR People's Deputy F. Burlatskiy:

In the course of the summer and fall sessions of the Supreme Soviet, active work took place to formulate laws touching on key problems of our economy, policy, and strategy and of the reforms being implemented in the period of perestroyka. Not infrequently, during discussions in the committees and commissions and at plenary sessions, theoretical and conceptual questions have come up, concerning our new ideas on the model of the economy or the political system and on the nature of the relationship between the Union and the republics. These problems need to be studied separately. That takes time and space.

That was when the idea sprang up of creating a deputies' club where such work could be done. The idea was discussed and supported by many deputies, primarily scientists: S. Alekseyev, Ye. Velikhov, N. Shmelev, A. Sobchak. The club's tasks are very diverse and cover both short-term and long-term questions. We intend in the near future to submit for discussion questions of the model of the Soviet federation, which is of concern to representatives of many republics, the multiplicity of forms of ownership, the deepening of political reform, the clearer demarcation of functions between the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and so forth.

Work on draft laws has prompted a desire on the part of deputies to supplement and extend their knowledge in the sphere of politics, law, the economy, and ecology. That is only natural. Many of the people's elected representatives do not have sufficient experience of public life and lack the necessary state outlook. One of the club's tasks is to hold lectures, seminars, "roundtables," and discussions to help deputies to master their new profession—the profession of a politician and statesman. They need to know how laws are drafted and written, they need to understand the evolution of legislation in our country and others. In addition, it is extremely important for people's deputies to learn to think logically and with concentration, to master a systematic approach to the information received, and to know how to develop and formulate ideas and concepts. Here they will be helped by specialists in various spheres of knowledge, both Soviet and foreign. In particular, representatives of the parliaments of the United States, France, and Britain have offered to tell our deputies about their standing orders and other procedural questions on which they have accumulated interesting experiences.

It is well known that a certain section of people's deputies is united by regional, interregional, and professional interests. In this connection we need some kind of institution where their opinions and ideas can be compared. In this way the conditions are created for bringing together differing positions, forming a consensus on particularly acute problems, and increasing mutual understanding. The club is a very effective means of bringing together the best ideas nurtured by deputies, ideas that will actively help to resolve the urgent problems that concern the whole country.

The club's organizational framework is very flexible. Every form of creative contact and debate will be used here. It is planned to entrust several cochairmen with the task of guiding this work, each of whom is a representative of a particular sphere of knowledge. The deputies could also elect a club council.

Yesterday, at the end of the evening plenary session of both chambers, the proposal to create a people's deputies' club at the USSR Supreme Soviet was heard and noted. The club will eventually become an important means of improving the Soviet parliamentarians' professional skills.

Gidaspov Address at 7 Dec Leningrad Meeting

90UN0452A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent report: "Fewer Emotions, More Intellect"]

[Text] Leningrad, 6 December—"We Leningraders, communists and nonparty people, declare our support for the policy of radical political and economic reforms being conducted in the country. We welcome the endeavors of M.S. Gorbachev and his supporters to impart to our society a democratic character and human face." These are lines from a resolution passed at a thousands-strong mass meeting held today in the city on the Neva. It was organized by the party club "For a Democratic Platform in the CPSU," USSR people's deputies, the Leningrad People's Front and other public organizations.

Less than 2 weeks have elapsed since a mass meeting, which has been evaluated variously, was held in Leningrad on the initiative of party committees of large industrial enterprises. It will take time to comprehend all that was said there. But even today the usefulness of the preceding forum is indicated if only by such facts as the slogans at the present meeting being more balanced and moderate and the categorical demands having diminished somewhat and emotions in the speeches having given way to constructive proposals pertaining to stabilization of the situation in the country.

"The party alone is not capable of tackling all the immense tasks posed by perestroyka," B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom [oblast and city party committees], who addressed the meeting, emphasized. "The consolidation of society's democratic forces is needed, and the fact that communist, nonparty people and representatives of public organizations of Leningrad have assembled here today instills confidence that we will succeed in achieving the unity of common action in the struggle for socialism and social justice."

Leningrad Obkom Discusses Plenum, Meeting

90UN0468A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 1

[Report by LenTASS correspondent V. Aleksandrov: "Not Temporizing, Acting"]

[Text] The communists and nonparty people and laboring Leningrad are at this time demanding one thing: That the decisions of the joint plenum of the obkom and gorkom [oblast and city party committees] and the platform of the Leningrad party organization under current conditions which was adopted there be followed by decisive action in support of the policy of perestroyka.

Numerous calls, letters and telegrams to the party authorities testify to this. People's frame of mind is one of actively joining in the work on realization of the basic propositions of this document, which is important for the region.

At the same time the voices of representatives of the forces which are attempting to portray these events as a step backward virtually, an offensive against democracy and an abrupt turn to the right are being heard also in the course of discussion of the results of the plenum and the citywide meeting at the V.I. Lenin Sports-Concert Complex.

Firmly and cogently rebuffing these attempts, explaining the plenum's decisions extensively in the workforce and adopting effective measures for their practical realization—these questions were at the center of the attention of a meeting yesterday in the Smolnyy of gorkom and raykom [city and rayon party committee] first secretaries and leaders of the region's soviet, trade union and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]. It was opened and chaired by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom.

He emphasized that the main task confronting the participants in the plenum and the mass meeting was channeling into the solution of the complex political and socioeconomic problems of Leningrad and the oblast the powerful, as yet not fully revealed, potential of the party organizations, exploding the passiveness of some communists and deploying them in a broad front against the shortcomings. This has been done to a considerable extent, but dawdling and simply affirming the existing omissions cannot now be allowed.

Proceeding from these fundamental positions, the reports of a number of communists—senior officials of the executive committees of the oblast and city soviets of people's deputies—were received. It was observed that the population today is no longer satisfied by promises to have the state of affairs in this area of the social sphere or the other put right in a few years time. Much may be done right now in the solution of questions of civic improvements and in bringing order to bear in trade and the fight against crime.

An analysis, for example, shows that such phenomena as cheating customers and concealing commodities from general sale, shameful for our city, frequently flourish with impunity in the trade sphere.

People who have besmirched themselves by glaring abuse of the rules of the sale of commodities to the public continue to work in responsible positions in stores of the "Gastronom" firm or the Lenkhoztorg or have been released at their own request.

Not being duly rebuked, on the party of the party organizations of this sphere either, some sales assistants have taken the path of bribe-taking and profiteering. In 10 months of the current year alone, subdivisions of the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Profiteering Service uncovered in trade 139 instances of embezzlement, in the public catering sector, 43, and in the Glavlenplodovoshchprom system, 11.

Numerous violations of legality are associated with the sale of liquor. Thus wine and vodka products have systematically been concealed from general sale and redirected to profiteers therein from Pskov and Novgorod oblasts by officials from certain stores of the Nevskiy, Kirovskiy and Kalininskiy rayon municipal foodstuffs trading organizations.

Seven criminal actions have been brought for instances of furniture speculation, in which officials of the Leningrad Furniture Trading Organization have been implicated.

The proposals of senior officials of the region's law enforcement authorities pertaining to a termination of such unlawful activity and the machinations in trade and the cooperative system were supported in this connection at the meeting. However, it was emphasized that this work needs to be developed extensively in all possible areas: Deputy formations, people's and worker control and youth operational squads should be enlisted extensively therein. The Leningrad Oblast and City soviet ispolkoms [executive committees], the Leningrad Oblast Council of Trade Unions and the Komsomol Oblast Committee should, given the organizing role of the party organizations, create a real front of struggle against crime and sabotage. This is a practicable matter, which is supported by the whole Leningrad community. It requires a radical approach and emergency action.

Questions connected with the decline in discipline at work were heard particularly pointedly in the speeches of a number of gorkom and raykom secretaries. This is connected to a certain extent with erroneous ideas concerning democracy and a weakening of exactingness for the entrusted job in various components of the workforce. Some managers are distancing themselves from serious problems concerning the restoration of order in this most important matter.

The gorkoms and raykoms and the party committees locally have been instructed to take the initiative and step up exactingness, primarily toward leaders of all levels, for the state of labor and financial discipline and for the lax management and lack of responsibility which have been manifested. It was pointed out that it is necessary to firmly pursue a consistent policy of the removal from office of officials who are failing to cope with their work and strengthening these areas with independent, creatively-minded specialists.

A whole number of other priority measures concerning practical fulfillment of the decisions of the joint plenum was examined.

Secretaries and heads of department of the obkom and gorkom participated in the meeting.

Moscow First Secretary Prokofyev Interviewed

90UN0426A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 49, 6 Dec 89 p 2

[Interview with Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent Ye. Domnyshevoy: "The Moscow Gorkom: Changes"]

[Text] [Domnyshevoy] Yuriy Anatolyevich, in the last few days you have become an object of intent attention and interest in connection with your election to new duties. I congratulate you. Every chief—Grishin, Yeltsin, Zaykov—had their own style of work. I would like to ask you, hoping for a candid answer, which of the styles is closest to you?

[Prokofyev] I do not intend to change my personal style of work. It was formed over many years. I consider it most important that a person in any post remain himself. The style I had in the rayon party committee, in the Moscow Soviet, in the gorkom—it remains. The most important is maximum interactions with people, accessibility, more consultation.... This we are doing already. In the last four days there was a meeting with propagandists from primary party organizations, 2,000 of them. And also good will toward people. This I consider most important.

[Domnyshevoy] Life has not been pampering us lately. We go around angry, seething.... Good news has become rare even for Muscovites. What, concretely, can change in the capital in the nearest future?

[Prokofyev] Moscow, I believe, now needs a consolidation of forces, and I see no reason for antagonism. A large part of Muscovites, party members, nonparty people, members of various informal politicized associations, see the obstacles on our path as well as the solutions to these problems their way. The most important thing now is to unite the efforts of Muscovites.

[Domnyshevoy] In your appearance on television you called bringing order to the city streets the first urgent task. In general we think of it as a task of the economic management services. Is there not something in your plans more substantive, more responsive to the Muscovites' expectations, longing for improvements?

[Prokofyev] I can well imagine that order on the streets, while important, is not the most serious problem of the city. There are more basic ones—a work force deficit which dictates the necessity to bring in up to 50,000 persons per year from the periphery. This situation greatly complicates the solution of social problems in the city, of which we have enough. But one must begin somewhere.... Besides that, order in the streets, smooth functioning of the city, are already crying problems. Therefore I feel that this should be taken up first. Especially since a well-functioning city is an area which depends entirely on us Muscovites.

[Domnyshevoy] There are rumors that certain raykoms [rayon party committees], using the inhabitants of Leningrad as an example, want to take their activists out onto the streets to hold meetings. Do you consider such a method of political manifestation practical and effective under present conditions?

[Prokofyev] The people poured out into the streets, to meetings, because they had been quiet for so long. There is a natural desire to speak one's mind. Therefore, if a primary organization or a raykom likes to conduct a meeting, I see nothing dangerous in it. One must only keep in mind that when an atmosphere of meeting springs up, large numbers of people gather together with good slogans supporting perestroyka, yet sometimes you will hear others that are quite the opposite. Are meetings effective? Yes, if they help to form public opinion around real problems of perestroyka, and are not be utilized by some group interests as a means of exerting pressure.

Further on Ligachev's Visit to Siberia

LD0912111189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The widest variety of issues pertaining to life and perestroyka were discussed at meetings held by Comrade [Ye.K.] Ligachev at labor collectives and with public organizations in the Tyumen and Tomsk Oblasts. The visit to Western Siberia was connected with monitoring fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee decision on the results of the stay of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the Tyumen oblast in 1985. Taking part in the conversations were the leaders of a number of ministries and departments, oblasts and cities, collective and state farms, oil and construction organizations.

Jewish Emigration Figures Cited

LD0812115189 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] It has been reported from Vienna that the number of Jews who have left the Soviet Union has reached a record 55,465 this year. The previous high was in 1979 when slightly over 51,000 emigrated. The ASSOCIATED PRESS notes that only two percent of that number have chosen Israel for residence.

Arkhangelsk Obkom Elects New First Secretary

LD2411143689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today a plenum of the Arkhangelsk Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] [RSFSR] was held to consider an organizational matter. The plenum released Comrade Telepnev from his duties as first secretary of the Obkom in connection with his request to retire.

More than 20 candidates were put forward for the post of first secretary of the Obkom, which were discussed beforehand in rayon and city party organizations and at a meeting of the bureau of the party obkom. By a majority of votes, Comrade Guskov who has worked as first deputy minister of the timber industry of the USSR and in the past as second secretary of the Arkhangelsk Obkom, was elected first secretary of the Arkhangelsk Obkom.

New Culture Minister Holds Press Conference

90UN0423A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Dec 89 p 2

[Article by Irina Pirogova: "Time Is Short!"]

[Text] Last Friday the first press conference of the new USSR Minister of Culture Nikolay Nikolayevich Gubenko for Soviet and foreign journalists was held:

"My presence in this building should begin with our society turning around to face culture, with a more attentive attitude toward the sore spots we have in our motherland, and not just here. At issue are also the artists who ended up abroad in the past for one reason or another and were stripped of their citizenship rights forcibly, which was reflected dramatically not only in their personal history but which also inflicted perceptible damage on our culture."

Which tasks does the new minister consider to be priorities? First of all, adopting the law on culture, in the absence of which he cannot conceive of a fundamental change in the existing situation.

Essentially, until now our culture has been decaying, with everyone looking on indifferently. However, N.N. Gubenko stressed that, due to the appearance of the new government and changes in thinking, some favorable prospects already emerged in the activities of his predecessor V.G. Zakharov. However, what is the specific role of the ministry in their development? First of all, the head of the ministry believes, it should give up many of its unnecessary functions and those that altogether set back its business. Most of these functions should be transferred to the creative arts unions in order to deprive the apparatus of the pressure force. "Seat-of-the-pants" detailed planning should be discontinued because planning the number of births of geniuses of the caliber of Pushkin or Bach is impossible.

The minister thinks that "we should engage in encouraging everything that is truly talented and economic issues. We should withdraw from the issues of repertory policy and the censorship function. We should encourage all those who think and create. We should get involved in registering and restoring cultural monuments in order to save from peril what we still have. Finally, we should pay attention to the sad existence of the employees of clubs, libraries, and museums who at present are the segment of cultural employees with the least social protection.

The position of the Ministry on Nationality Issues, which will be based on the legislation currently being adopted, is conceived in a manner new in principle. The policy of diktat, of foisting gigantic, lavish, expensive, and, ultimately, formal and showy festivals has outlived itself completely. Apart from everything else, is it proper to plan average indicators for the more than 100 peoples living in our country, the peoples with their original traditions? Indeed, Estonia, for example, is famous for mass choir art. Besides, over there it serves as a means of communication and rapprochement among people. In

Uzbekistan the tea shops have been the cells of communication, clubs of sorts, for centuries. However, all of this is absolutely no reason to foist choir singing on Fergana and, say, plan to open a tea shop in Tartu.

Questions, more questions....

In his recent speeches Nikolay Nikolayevich has stressed that he has no plans to give up theater. However, how does this look in practice given the tremendous amount of work which may swamp him?

Gubenko's mood is optimistic. He thinks that being a minister is not a profession. He is planning to continue acting on days off by agreement with the theater.

The answers by N.N. Gubenko, especially with regard to theater issues, frequently did not fit the pattern of customary answers, say, the issue of attendance in provincial theaters. One of the journalists expressed his concern about this, whereas the minister reacted somewhat differently. In his opinion, the state culture has lost the initiative, and at present the informal culture (say, video) is far ahead of the state. However, this is not the only reason for the alienation of the mass audience from the theater.

He said: "Very frequently these are not theaters but just buildings. We have more than 650 buildings throughout the country, but few theaters."

Indeed, why do we need this huge army of actors and directors, which we subsidize every year? Having given an individual the diploma, we have the obligation to place him in a job. Meanwhile, the diploma is no guarantee of talent at all. Hence the poor performances, and the new wave of conflicts sweeping the theaters between those who can play Hamlet and those who would like to but have no requisite skills. Certainly, this is an eternal conflict, but are we not fanning the flames by cranking out theatrical mediocrities in great numbers? In this matter, the role of creative arts unions is very significant; they should not be departments, states within states, but should be genuine and zealous defenders of the interests of artists that are capable of influencing the process of cultural edification of the people and, perhaps, defining it. Otherwise, we will never eliminate the paradox that exists: Culture is there by itself, and life by itself, as a result of which the lack of culture has taken over in politics, economics, and morality.

How are we to overcome this?

Only by offensive actions; there should be no defense by any means. Beginning with the supreme leadership, the people should see what is happening to culture and be aware of its sore spots. Local intellectuals—physicians, teachers, specialists—who in times immemorial determined the spiritual atmosphere of their large and small cities and villages, have a tremendous role to play. We have forgotten about their potential. In this regard, the concept by Chingiz Aytmatov on holding an annual assembly of representatives of the local intelligentsia appears very important. N.N. Gubenko expressed his complete support for this initiative.

N.N. Gubenko stressed that the previous state policy suppressed not only the creative individual but also the official. Perestroyka is exactly what makes it possible to change the situation fundamentally. He believes that the abolition of serfdom was the first such historical opportunity, the Great October Socialist Revolution the second, and perestroyka the third.

In the system of our national cultural values, the V.I. Lenin State Library holds a special place. This is why it is not surprising that its dramatic situation is of concern to many people. What does the minister think about this? He believes that we need a library of the highest technical standard, similar to the U.S. Library of Congress. It must be built. What are we to do about the present library? Thus far the Ministry of Culture has followed the old approach: Let us use up the funds allocated for repairs, or else they may be taken away. This is how the "holes" were patched.

A USSR Supreme Soviet commission has now taken up this issue. It has been resolved to set up an independent group of experts, including geologists, engineers, economists, library specialists, and scientists. Foreign currency has been allocated for remodeling.

Since the conversation touched on the "sore spots" directly related to the capital, I also could not but name one of them that requires the Ministry of Culture to be particularly aggressive. SOVETSKAYA KULTURA has reported repeatedly on the intolerable situation that has emerged in the sphere of material-technical support for cultural exchanges with foreign countries.

For a number of years the USSR Ministry of Culture and the All-Union Association Goskontsert have been experiencing continuous difficulties putting up foreign and Soviet cultural personalities participating in international exchanges in the hotels of Moscow, providing airline and railroad tickets for them on domestic and international lines and motor transportation. On 31 December 1987 the USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Material-Technical Support for Cultural Contacts Between the USSR and Foreign Countries" was adopted. These issues have been raised many times with the leadership of the executive committee of the Moscow Soviet.

However, the execution of the Council of Ministers resolution has been virtually obstructed. The assignment by the USSR Council of Ministers to hand over the hotel Bucharest to the USSR Ministry of Culture for putting up foreign participants in cultural exchanges has not been carried out. The assignment of the USSR Council of Ministers envisaged by the resolution in question and providing for the allocation of slots in the Moscow hotels of the superior category for the ministry in order to put up foreign actors and delegations of cultural personalities (until the remodeling of the hotel Bucharest is completed) is not being carried out by the city authorities. The USSR Ministry of Culture and the Goskontsert, which does practical work on organizing cultural exchanges, still do not have any guaranteed allocation of slots for putting up foreign guests and Soviet actors in Moscow hotels.

For how long are the arbitrariness of some Moscow Soviet divisions and their glaring political shortsightedness going to go unpunished, damaging irreparably the international prestige of our country?

N.N. Gubenko raises the issue sharply. Patience is at an end. We must fight and demand that those to blame be punished. The public needs to be aroused.

He said, his intonation not humorous at all: "I am no proponent of strikes; however, if they are not going to help us, the ministry will be forced to resort to extreme measures with regard to those who are sabotaging the resolution of the government."

The press conference lasted slightly longer than 2 hours but, of course, not all of the problems could be touched upon. However, the journalists were assured that such meetings will now be held on a monthly basis. So, let us wait for a continuation of our conversation. Let us defend the interests of our native culture together.

Time is short!

Moscow Journalists Set Up 'Independent' Agency

PM1112125389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 1

[Unattributed, untitled report on formation of NOTA BENE PRESS news agency]

[Text] An independent news agency, NOTA BENE PRESS, has been set up at the initiative of a group of professional journalists working in the journal MOLODOY KOMMUNIST and other Moscow publications. The International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind, the Moscow Commercial Association, the Interregional Deputy Group, and the representative body of the international Greenpeace organization have expressed willingness to cooperate with the agency.

Kuzbass Miners Form New Workers Union

904F0032A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 p 2

[Article by A. Parshintsev: "Arguments in the Kuzbass"]

[Text] Last Saturday and Sunday the House of Political Education in Novokuznetsk resembled the city squares of the Kuzbass in July. The same passions raged in its auditorium as in the days of the miners' strikes. However, the striving of the delegates of labor collectives who gathered for their fourth conference not only to set up a union and discuss and adopt its program and statute, but also to work out a concept of economic operations was apparent despite the high pitch of emotions.

Perhaps this striving was seen most clearly in the course of discussing the economic status of the region. In particular, the delegates acknowledged the pace of fulfillment of the joint protocol signed by a government commission after the strike to be unsatisfactory, especially the fulfillment of one of its main points—on giving complete economic and legal independence to the mines, strip mines, and other enterprises of the Kuzbass. In the opinion of the delegates, the slowdown originates both from the center and in the field. Participants in the conference stressed that there will be no advancement unless coal associations are liquidated, debts of mines and strip mines are forgiven in the course of transition to their independence, and a fair price for the coal sold is set.

The objectives and tasks of the workers' movement expressed in its program and statute as they emerged after the summer strike are not perceived unambiguously. The decision to, for example, set up a free enterprise zone in the Kuzbass caused much controversy even among the delegates. However, pronouncements were also persistently made to the effect that the dogmas accumulated over the years need to be abandoned, and a regional economic model geared for meeting the social needs of the residents of the oblast needs to be built on the basis of a sober-minded assessment of our own and world economic experience and using common sense. It was also stressed that this model should reconcile in the most organic manner the interests of both the region and the state.

Still, in the opinion of some delegates, the discussion of economic issues was not definitively completed. The heated debate came to a climax in the course of discussing the draft statute or, more precisely, in the course of determining the status of the new union, of what it is to be—a public or a sociopolitical organization. By a majority vote, the latter status was opted for. The Union of Workers of the oblast transformed itself into the Union of Toilers of the Kuzbass.

Many of those who listened to the live broadcast on the oblast radio were bewildered: "What is it, a new party?" Incidentally, rumors about the formation of some new party based on the Union of Toilers of the Kuzbass attracted to the conference the attention of many foreign journalists and representatives of many political trends who preached their views during the breaks. The conference inserted a point in the program to the effect that the Union of Toilers of the Kuzbass does not claim the role of a new party and operates on the basis of observing the Constitution in effect and Soviet legislation in order to put an end to all kinds of second-guessing.

Technically, the union has been created. What happens next? Will the broad masses of the Kuzbass accept its program and statute? This is not a rhetorical question. Among many telegrams of approval that were addressed to the conference, there were also telegrams to the contrary, for example: "Who has given the delegates the authority to make decisions for all of the Kuzbass?" There is a message in this retort: After all, envoys from mining collectives constituted an overwhelming majority of the conference. There were only four representatives of the agro-industrial complex among the delegates and virtually no employees of the chemical industry, construction, and many other popular professions. Besides, six cities of the Kuzbass sent no delegates at all.

In a word, I would not venture a prediction on the future of the new union; time will tell. Something else is indisputable, though: The workers' movement, thus far essentially that of miners, is becoming an organized force.

Interior Ministry Briefing Held on New Laws

LD1212210889 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 12 TASS—A briefing here today was devoted to the participation of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior in drawing up bills aiming to strengthen legality and guarantees of rights and interests of Soviet citizens in line with the provisions of international acts signed by the Soviet Union.

Several bills, in the preparation of which the Soviet Interior Ministry was instrumental, have been submitted for the consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the briefing was told.

For example, the draft laws of the Soviet Union "On the rights and duties of the Soviet militia" and "On the duties and rights of the Soviet Interior Ministry troops in maintaining public order" have been worked out for the first time.

They define the legal status of the militia and the Internal Ministry troops, regulate their rights and duties and define the procedure and conditions for their involvement in the protection of public peace as well as the grounds and procedure for the use of special means and weapons.

An important measure is the working out of a bill on the organisation and holding of rallies, demonstrations, meetings and street marches. It envisages the procedure for notification about mass events and contains an exhaustive list of grounds for suspending mass events and names officials enpowered to take decisions on these matters.

The draft fundamentals of the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics, the briefing was told, envisage substantial limitations on imposing death penalties: Only six of the criminal charges (excluding military crimes) for which capital punishment may be demanded are left instead of thirty-two envisaged by earlier legislation.

In addition, the Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted regulatory enactments ensuring the exercise of constitutional rights of citizens during the criminal process.

The fundamentals of legislation of the USSR and the union republics about courts envisage that the suspect individual, the accused and the defendant have the right to legal protection.

This right is ensured by the participation of a lawyer from the moment of detention, arrest, or presentation of charges.

The law of the USSR "On alterations and amendments to Article 34 of the fundamentals of the criminal procedure of the USSR and the union republics" identifies the maximum term of detention during the preliminary investigation—eighteen months.

It is established that the prolongation of this term is not admissible and upon the expiry of the term and accused is immediately set free.

The work to improve Soviet legislation along these lines is going on.

Emigration, Travel Regulations Explained

LD1212231489 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 12 TASS—The number of applications from Soviet citizens for permission to travel to other countries and/or invite guests from other countries amounted, in the first half of 1989, to more that 1.7 million, or three times as much as in 1987.

Between January and October 1989, permission to leave for permanent residence in other countries was granted to 171,000 Soviet citizens, which is 2.3 times more than during the respective period of the previous year.

Practically all requests to leave have been met, except for a mere 0.4 per cent.

This was reported on Tuesday [12 December] at a briefing in the Soviet Interior Ministry.

The simplification of the procedure for exiting and entering the country, the briefing was told, was facilitated by a number of recent specific steps taken in the Soviet Union to expand contacts between Soviet citizens and citizens from other countries on a personal basis, which ensure, in line with the final document of the Vienna meeting, the right of every Soviet citizen to leave the Soviet Union and to return to his country.

A considerable part of earlier restrictions on foreign travel has been lifted and the procedure has been simplified.

The control over the correctness of negative replies by Interior Ministry offices to requests to leave is exercised by the Commission of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for questions of citizenship.

The bill on the procedure for leaving and entering the Soviet Union has passed first reading at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The bill envisages the right of every Soviet citizen to leave the country and re-enter it. The bill abolishes the need for invitations to travel abroad and identifies grounds for negative decisions, that are of temporary nature.

The bill establishes a system of legal and court-room defence by citizens of their rights and interests in connection with leaving the Soviet Union.

Constructive Response to Critics Urged

PM2711111189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent N. Mironov report under the rubric "The Party and the Soviet Elections": "The Other Side's Opinion"]

[Text] Dnepropetrovsk-Zaporozhye—Recently the DNEPR VECHERNIY newspaper carried a letter from USSR People's Deputy A. Nazarenko under the anxious headline "How we are to go on living." The item was prompted by an appeal from a group of Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and local soviet deputies to the oblast's population which had been published somewhat earlier. The deputies expressed concern at the prevailing situation resulting from the increased activity of Rukh and the informal associations.

"The people must learn the truth, the real state of affairs, and their way ahead not from the mouths of various extremist groupings," they wrote. And the truth, in their opinion, is that the "new informal organization—the so-called Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka, whose activity is fundamentally unacceptable to the republic's political system and is aimed not at consolidating all forces but at dividing them—is diverting working people from the practical solution of the tasks of renewing our society."

The deputies, incidentally, did not support their thesis with facts, because they assume that what they say goes. However, they also leveled a completely unsupported rebuke at People's Deputy A. Nazarenko. "Does he perhaps have something to do with this movement?" So through the newspaper he had to explain his true position with regard to both Rukh and the other informal groups. He expressed his position quite clearly and unambiguously. "It isn't all that simple," Nazarenko wrote. "I attended the Rukh constituent congress and I can state with the utmost responsibility that, despite the excessively emotional tone, lack of experience, ambiguity of attitudes, and even extremist attacks by individual participants in the congress, this movement is fundamentally healthy and positive. The resolutions, rules, and program adopted by Rukh at the congress have nothing to do with extremism or nationalism. This is an international mass organization of working people."

Is Nazarenko's position open to dispute? Definitely! That's why we have pluralism of opinions. But if you are going to raise objections you must have evidence and arguments. And the more weightily and calmly they are expressed, the more you will convince the audience.

Today, unfortunately, both calm and evidence are in short supply. More often than not they are simply absent on both sides. It is easy to see that for yourself by going to the informal groups' rallies and to local party committee plenums and by reading the local newspapers. The passions and the mutual recriminations are becoming increasingly heated, at times overwhelming the voices not only of opponents but also of the protagonist's own side. This prevents a serious consideration of what has been said or a critical attitude to one's own position: Is it really beyond reproach?

This confrontation is becoming particularly sharp in the preparation for the upcoming local elections. Many people, including party and soviet workers, are increasingly worried: What will the future corps of deputies be like? Will they be sufficiently principled or adhere firmly to the positions of socialist renewal? Will they be able to put the voters' aspirations into effect? Such questions were also raised recently in the report by V. Yatsuba, first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk party city committee [gorkom], at a gorkom plenum which examined communists' tasks in the preparation for the elections of republic and local soviet deputies.

What is the cause of these anxieties? Do some people really not want the people's elected representatives to be "principled and firm"? Do they not want them to reflect the opinion of the voters rather than of individuals or groups? Surely such people can't exist. But yes, they do, the gorkom secretary asserts. They "groundlessly denigrate our party," he believes. "They cast doubt on the gains of the Great October Revolution and the Soviet people." Admittedly, during our conversation it turned out that in saying that, Vladimir Grigoryevich means primarily the "small group of loudmouths and demagogues, opportunists, and street extremists, blatant nationalists, and anarchists." They are the ones, he added, who stir the people up at rallies by taking advantage of our present difficulties, and refuse to listen to us.

Well, there really are loudmouths and demagogues in the city. But when was that not the case? But if, as V. Yatsuba himself acknowledges, they are few in number and if in the main the informal groups support perestroyka, why be so alarmed and be in such a hurry to pin labels? Perhaps, on the contrary, we should be glad that more and more working people are becoming involved in political life, since this will help to overcome the alienation from power. But a strange situation is taking shape. The fate of perestroyka worries both those whom the party gorkom labels "loudmouths" and party and soviet workers. Mutual recriminations fly from both sides when perestroyka goes wrong. But for some reason attempts to seriously analyze the reasons for the disruptions or take account of the useful and constructive aspects in each opponent's position are nowehere to be seen. Is it any wonder that there is increasing alienation rather than mutual understanding?

In that context I asked V. Yatsuba to comment on USSR People's Deputy A. Nazarenko's article in the newspaper.

"It is a good article," he replied. "Particularly in that section where he talks about the need for exactingness toward those whose work shows shortcomings. But I cannot agree with his assessment of Rukh."

Well, let us talk about the criticisms of shortcomings in work and increasing exactingness toward them. On a number of occasions this year, for example, local party organs examined the state of affairs in trade, supply, and the construction of social facilities—in brief, they tried to investigate the most sensitive and acute questions troubling the city's population. And the result? The last party gorkom plenum established that the situation is not improving. The informal groups have been saying that at rallies, too. But some people on the party gorkom do not like that. Does that mean then that you can criticize shortcomings at a gorkom plenum but not at rallies? We are rejecting other people's opinions out of hand without even examining them. Even though the mere fact that some decisions have been unproductive should make people think.

The following fact shows that the approach to problems is not always sufficiently competent or thorough. This summer the Dnepropetrovsk party gorkom plenum examined the question of improving citizens' food supply. There was a report, there were speeches, but the plenum offered no constructive action program. The matter was essentially reduced to the proposal... to hear a report on this theme by the chairman of the oblast agro-industrial committee at the party oblast committee plenum. This "measure" left a bitter taste in people's mouths, including communists. But let us note that the replacement of proper analysis by the mere listing of facts is still the weak point of many such reports and decisions at party committee plenums and local soviet sessions. And the deliberate prejudice against the opinion of the "other side"—the dissidents—is particularly inappropriate. It is still often the case that when the latter cite specific errors by this or that committee some people try to present this as criticism of "the entire party." Whereas if an order is issued "from above" people jump to attention and carry it out, sometimes without even thinking about it.

Here is a typical episode taken from a recent session of the Zaporozhye party oblast committee [obkom] bureau, which examined (for the umpteenth time) the question of vegetable supplies to the citizens. The day before, the republic's Council of Ministers adopted a decision to set rigid seasonal retail prices for all types of vegetables. At the obkom bureau session one speaker tried to challenge that action. In his opinion, it is the inflexibility of purchase prices which is hampering the solution of vegetable supply problems. After all, it is often the case that the unduly low prices make it unprofitable for farms to grow and harvest their vegetables. They are left in the fields or used as animal feed.

So what happened? The chairman interrupted the speaker abruptly: "Let's leave the price question alone. The decision has already been taken at the top."

The informal groups often attack party committees and local authorities precisely on specific matters and talk about the invalidity of decisions taken on that score. What is there to say to them? Communists rightly advise that we need not emotions or hot-tempered "rebukes" and instructions but well considered decisions and the clear organization of their fulfillment. That will be the best answer to "outside" criticism.

People may say to me: But the city party organization has published the platform on which it is going to fight the elections. Yes, there is such a platform, and a pretty vast one it is, too. It seems to have everything in it; it even says that "the party gorkom supports constructive dialogue and cooperation with all independent formations." But I would like to see a greater constructive element in it and concrete "bridges" leading to real contacts and the practical solution of the problems worrying citizens.

But here are the thoughts that occur to you when you read this document. It says that the concrete and socially significant actions for the whole party organization for the next few years are the comprehensive development of the social infrastructure, the elaboration and implementation of the general plan, the solution of the most urgent water and heat supply problems... There are also promises to "increase the production of consumer goods and foodstuffs and establish order in their distribution." Important points indeed. But look at many of the decisions of past years and you will find the same things. Probably it would be a good idea to state in the platform what the party organization intends to do to break the deadlock that exists with regard to its previous decisions on these key questions and get things moving. It would probably be useful to seek an answer to that question in conjunction with communists and all the city's working people. And that includes the informal group members.

Gorkom Secretary V. Yatsuba agrees:

"Yes, there are talented people among them, there are many we could work with...."

So let's work and not just enter into conflict! Of course this means working hand in hand with those who are concerned not with self publicity but with people's interests and the common cause.

Let us go back to the beginning—the letter from the group of local soviet deputies and the reply from A. Nazarenko. Of course, the easiest thing of all would be to dismiss the informal group members by calling them extremists or nationalists and saying that they cannot be believed... But Nazarenko emphasizes different aspects: Everyone should work together to find out why perestroyka is marking time in the oblast and find ways to ensure that there is more produce in the stores, that transport works better, and that the housing lists are shortened.

These really are the common concerns of all supporters of perestroyka. But it would clearly be more logical to address this appeal not to some abstract population but to specific people. For example, to local soviet deputies. They should be urged first and foremost to take an active stance, the "scarcity" of which was brought to mind yet again by the recent session of the Dnepropetrovsk city soviet, which was effectively wrecked by the failure of many deputies to turn up. Yet they were supposed to attend that session to elect a city soviet chairman, an officer that this city of 1 million people has been without for around 2 months now. Or doesn't it need a city soviet chairman? Unfortunately, this question is not rhetorical. A speaker at the session, Kirovskiy party rayon committee first secretary A. Safronova, suggested that a chairman shouldn't be elected at all until after the local soviet election scheduled, as we know, for next spring. We'll get by somehow... till next spring. We'll make do with deputy chairmen.

The fate of perestroyka depends on how principled the positions taken by party committees and communists as a whole are. And if there are disagreements with others who also campaign for perestroyka, would it not be better not to engage in mutual recriminations and abuse but to sit down at a roundtable meeting or organize some televised debates? Or to make more active use of the local mass media to enable the leaders of the city and the oblast to answer people's most urgent questions? And to seek other ways to achieve consolidation?

Then people can see that and judge it for themselves.

USSR MVD Briefing Defends Militia Actions

PM1312170989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Single Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Briefing Held"]

[Text] Rally democracy is a new phenomenon for our country, and that is why it often acquires a form that comes directly under the law-enforcement organs' "sphere of interests." In official language, this is called "mass violations of public order." And often, regardless of what these manifestations develop into, the militia's actions are unequivocally assessed as outbursts of lawlessness and tyranny.

At a briefing at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] 12 December, Militia Major General V. Maksimov, first deputy chief of the Maintenance of Public Order Main Administration, told journalists about the most graphic manifestations of such "democracy" and what part the militia played in them.

The events in Kishinev, when an aggressive mob tried to disrupt the military parade and people lay down in the path of armored troop carriers, are still in our minds. And then, when they were moved out of the way, they started fighting the militia. But this was just a prelude to 10 November. The republic's MVD building was actually blockaded and then stones, petrol bombs, and explosives were thrown at the militiamen. The USSR people's deputies who had arrived there did not help—and incidentally, one of them was riding in a State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration vehicle which was turned over then and there and burned before the deputy's very eyes...

In short, the militia was forced to use special means: rubber nightsticks and "cheremukha" [riot control agent]. Incidentally, more of the latter was used than during the Tbilisi events, but not a single report of poisoning was made.

As a result of the disorders, 145 internal troops servicemen were injured, with 36 of them hospitalized; 73 militia officials and 77 citizens were also injured. Some soldiers were severely beaten.

Rovno—Materials regarding certain people against whom administrative proceedings had been instituted for violating the procedure for holding a rally were examined at the end of October in the people's court. A crowd of around 400 people in the hall impeded the court in every way and then blockaded the building. The judge called the militia. The patrol that arrived was spat on, their shoulder straps were torn off, and they were jostled. It is hard to say how all this would have ended if it had not been for the decisive measures taken by the militia.

Lvov—A crowd tried to enter the Internal Affairs Administration building in order to liberate the detained Revtya, who, as it later turned out, was himself one of the crowd.

Where in the world can such things still happen? Just try and take a police station by storm, or spit on a policeman somewhere in the West! How much could be written on this subject! Although it is considered that the existing legislation provides enough opportunity for militia officials to take tough action while remaining within the limits of the law, practice shows that the militia official is prepared to be punched in the face—I'm sorry to put it like this—one more time rather than later having to explain himself in a dozen offices...

"We are not excluding the possibility of disorders also occurring during the congress," V. Maksimov said. The Moscow militia's conditions for performing their duties have been intensified, and the number of patrols has been increased. Attention paid to suburban trains, in which a great number of crimes take place, has been increased. Prior to the start of the congress a whole series of raids was carried out with the participation of USSR MVD officials. Crime in Moscow has now dropped significantly, the major general reported. "But if something happens, we will act resolutely. Democracy is not total license!" V.Maksimov noted.

Hardships of Alternative Military Service Noted

PM0712170589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Captain M. Zheglov article in response to reader's letter under the rubric "At Readers' Request": "What Is Alternative Service?"; first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Excerpts] Various mass media articles frequently mention the term "alternative service." I would like to find out what is referred to here and whether anything similar exists in other countries.

[Signed] Major A. Fedorov, Carpathian Military District.

You are right, Comrade Fedorov, the question of alternative service or, as it is still described, service without weapons, is being debated quite vigorously in certain mass media. It is also included in the programs of the Baltic republic people's fronts. People striving to introduce this kind of service in the USSR cite foreign experience. [passage omitted].

The problem of alternative service also exists in socialist countries. Each of them resolves it in accordance with its defense requirements and capabilities, mindful of public opinion and the political and legal aspects. Poland was the first socialist state to replace military service with civilian work. This right is only extended to young people who experience difficulties in accepting military service owing to religious considerations. The duration of their work is 3 years (2 years for graduates of higher educational establishments). The appropriate grounds and written evidence are presented to the military draft commission prior to receipt of the draft notice. This commission's members decide by a vote. It is stipulated that army representatives do not have the right to interfere in this process at any stage. Those people whose applications are accepted work in public health organs, land reclamation, and so on. Moreover, the work place does not have to be near their place of residence. The objectors receive 1 week, 9 days, and 2 weeks' leave in the 1st, 2d, and 3d years of work, respectively, to visit their relatives.

The GDR makes no provision for an alternative to military service. However, there is the possibility of serving without weapons for 18 months in special construction subunits. Young people of draft age receive this right on religious grounds alone. Unlike draftees, they are sent to the subunit without a ceremonial sendoff. They receive a dark gray uniform on site with a spade depicted on the shoulder strap. They make a solemn promise instead of taking an oath. The operation of the regulations extends to them. They work, as a rule, on the construction of highways and highway structures, barracks, and apartment blocks for officers. They are involved in eliminating the damage caused by troop exercises and carry out certain other jobs.

As we can see, Comrade Fedorov, every country resolves the question of alternative service differently. What I would like to stress is that it is not perceived by public opinion in the aforementioned countries as the best choice all the same. I have already said that the people who choose this option end up in the hardest and least prestigious work. Certainly the attitude to the army and military service in these countries is one of respect and, consequently, there is a corresponding attitude to those people who evade military service. Thus, people pondering questions of alternative service in our country also have food for thought.

CPSU Greets Military-Political Academy

PM1512095889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[CPSU Central Committee message: "To the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee greets the collective of the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy on the 70th anniversary of its formation.

From the earliest days of its existence the academy became a center for training skilled political cadres for the Soviet Armed Forces. Its graduates always showed devotion to socialist ideals, championed party policy among the troops, and were in the front ranks of the Motherland's defenders. The glorious traditions of the commissars and political leaders are continued and augmented by new generations of political workers.

Perestroyka in all aspects of the Armed Forces' life and activity sets the academy's command and professorial and teaching staff the task of further improving the training of political workers. Political cadres are today required to work skillfully among the masses of servicemen in the light of the sociopolitical situation, to have a mastery of political methods of leadership, to be closer to people, to show day-to-day concern for them, and to be the soul and conscience of the military collectives. Together with commanding officers, political workers are called upon to rally the servicemen, strengthen discipline, international friendship, and soldierly comradeliness, and assert social justice.

The CPSU Central Committee expresses firm confidence that the collective and graduates of the academy will continue persistently to improve party political work and increase its role and influence in resolving the responsible tasks facing the Armed Forces.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee

Young Philosophers Consider Russia's Role

PM1312125789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[A. Ivanov article: "The Philosophy of History: A Dialogue Between Cultures"]

[Text] This problem united the country's young philosophers, gathered for the Ninth All-Union Philosophy Readings. The tradition of readings, which started in 1981, has recently been given new substance.

Around 200 young scholars met to attempt to find a solution to eternal problems that would be consonant with today's situation. The fact that the main thrust of the questing and discussions was not restricted to a range of "purely philosophical questions" was a substantive point. A philosophy that lacks any knowledge of its own history is fruitless. And that is why the growing interest in the problems of historical philosophy on the part of the young people present was understandable. This means that the young philosophers' attention to Russian history is equally natural. It does not take a great deal of courage now to claim that our society was inclined from the outset toward totalitarian forms of organization and administration. And it is gratifying that the participants in the discussion, overcoming their possible abstract one-sidedness, strove to engage in a meaningful and more concrete discussion. "Round tables," "Socialism in the Context of World History," and "Russia as a Problem of Philosophical History" were the main focal points for trenchant discussions. The "Russian idea" and its fate; Russia as a meeting place for Western and Eastern cultures; relations between the people and the authorities; the Russian language as the source and secret of Russian philosophy; "imperial awareness" and its metamorphoses—these and many other problems were keenly discussed from the philosophical, historical, culturological, and sociopsychological standpoints. This multifaceted, interdisciplinary approach was conducive to the raising of interesting new problems which remain "outside the framework" of empty philosophizing that is unburdened by any scientific or historico-cultural core.

Apart from the dialogue between philosophy and other sciences, and between classical philosophy and the new type of philosophy, that is emerging at the close of the 20th century, there was an instructive dialogue between the older and younger generations in which many philosophers and scholars took part. This dialogue was probably the main feature of the "readings." After all, the reason this tradition exists is to have an intellectual discussion untouched by the hand of officialdom. The "readings" were organized by the USSR Philosophy Society and the USSR Association of Young Philosophers.

Mayorov on 'Painful Memory' of Stalinism

LD0912141289 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] At a meeting in Moscow this week the leaders of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Soviet Union denounced the introduction of troops of these five countries into Czechoslovakia in 1968. That decision is described as erroneous in a Soviet Government statement. It may seem strange to some that events of more than 20 years ago should be recalled.

A glance back into history may seem even stranger, writes Radio Moscow's Mikhail Mayorov, if one takes into account the fact that the reforms in Eastern Europe now reveal clearly a desire to break up with the past. And yet we do take this glance back. Why? It is obvious that this is due exactly to the fact that in the socialist countries events ae taking place when the process of renewal goes hand in hand with a tortuous and dramatic reassessment of the past. Just as there is no future without the past perestroyka would have been impossible without a critical look at the errors, drawbacks, and deformities of the past years.

We here in the Soviet Union have been purifying ourselves of the layers of Stalinism. Stalin is long gone from the political scene but his heritage lingers on. Today by the efforts of eyewitnesses, historians, and journalists a full picture is being recreated of what happened in the towns of the gulag archipelago. Are these empty reminiscences? To think in this way amounts to living by the former distorted notions of socialism. But as we study our experience we want to put everything in its proper place. Our approach is also quite severe to the years linked with the rule by Leonid Brezhnev. It was action (?on) what the West calls the Brezhnev Doctrine that a decision was made in 1968 to send troops of the five allied countries to Czechoslovakia. It is bitter to realize that after 1945 when Soviet tanks brought freedom to Prague, which arose against Nazi occupation, in 1968 it was not flowers at all that were thrown at the Soviet tanks. The past reminds those who are spearheaded [as heard] into the future that no more tragic mistakes should be made. That is why Stalinism is a painful memory to us, as it is for the Czechs and the Slovaks at the end of the Prague Spring of 1968, for the Hungarians in the events of 1956, and for Poles the events of Katyn. No these are not empty reminiscences, not a desire to rewrite some pages in the textbook of history, although what can be more important for the younger generation than historical truth?

The idea is to make a breakthrough in the minds of people, in the way of thinking and to widen the horizon of our notions about the nature of relationships between the socialist countries and about socialism as a whole, for that matter. The eye opening may be belated and difficult to achieve, writes Mikhail Mayorov, but what other way to the truth is easy?

Foreign Ministry Official on Human Rights

90UI0209A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 50, 13 Dec 89 p 14

[Article by Sergey Kosenko, adviser of the Administration for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the USSR Foreign Ministry: "Know, Understand, Implement"]

[Text] Champions of human rights will most likely never be able to feel at ease anywhere. There have been and will continue to be violations of generally recognized human rights always and everywhere, in any society, in any state, regardless of social system. The difference is merely whether these violations are of a systematic, mass, and repressive nature, or whether they have been caused by "costs" in the work of the administration and individual officials, the imperfection of legislation, and a lack of legal culture. In the latter case such violations are easily contested and corrected, judicially, for example. If a state does not consciously limit human rights, there is no reason, either, to fear criticism on anyone's part for their episodic violations. The truly law-based state will always be able to reveal its essence, thanks to purposive, constant, and all-embracing legislative activity in defense of the rights of its citizens, and necessarily with regard for its international treaty commitments in this sphere. Such work in the USSR has already begun. It will not be completed tomorrow, of course.

The USSR citizen in the law-based state must clearly know what the extent of his real rights and duties is and what the methods are of securing these rights in accordance with domestic legislation, and also with current international agreements which have been signed and ratified by our country. He should know, for example, that there are approximately two dozen such fundamental agreements and that the main ones are the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights and the International Pact on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. There are few people in the Soviet Union evidently, other than specialists, who know that the provisions of a number of important UN documents are in force in many countries, albeit of a nonbinding nature, such as the Minimum Standard Rules of the Treatment of Prisoners; the Code of Behavior of Officials in Maintaining Law and Order; Basic Principles of the Independence of the Judiciary; Principles of Medical Ethics; and many other useful rules.

For a long time our diplomacy upheld the priority of socioeconomic rights over civil and political rights. These latter, and the concept of human rights itself, were frequently put in quotation marks and interpreted virtually as a "bourgeois invention". It is not surprising, therefore, that the degree of realization of socioeconomic rights under the conditions of socialism was presented onesidedly, as was the castigation of the "total lack of human rights in the capitalist world." We have learned under the conditions of perestroyka, in line with the growth of democratization and glasnost, that the former interpretation was "not entirely" in keeping with reality. And now Soviet diplomats in the UN bodies may speak with a sigh of relief about the inseparable unity and interdependence of all human rights.

Indeed, is the unemployed or homeless person in a capitalist country capable of enjoying to the full extent the freedom of movement which he is afforded, or freedom of correspondence? "Of course not," replies the France-based "Fourth World" international public organization in defense of the destitute. In just the same way the guarantee of employment under socialism does not in itself lessen man's need for adequate wages or the freedom to express his opinion, including on political issues.

Only a balanced, intelligent approach to the delicate sphere of human rights makes it possible to avoid excesses, distortions, and extremes in the most complex situations. And this rule extends, what is more, to international negotiations, organs of power, public organizations, and individual citizens.

Only developed civil legal consciousness and people's due knowlegeability about their rights may constitute the firm basis of all correct actions in defense of human rights. How is this to be achieved? Would it be sufficient under our country's conditions to simply publish and disseminate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international pacts, and other documents on this question in millions of copies? Most likely, it would not. Too large a number of people and whole generations have for too long been imbibing a dogmatic, scornful, and superficial attitude toward human rights and their place in the state structure. For any Frenchman, for example, the very term "human rights" is comprehensible, figuratively speaking, from the cradle because he has been taught such in school for the past 200 years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen in 1789.

Can such education be organized in the Soviet Union? It can and should be. Not only the humane designs of socialism and not only the letter and spirit of the said international pacts, but UN decisions that are further removed from day-to-day life, but which are morally binding, also call for this. Thus in March 1989, at a session of the UN Human Rights Commission, the USSR coauthored Resolution 1989/53 providing for a world human rights information campaign. It recommends in the course of the UN world campaign, in particular, the introduction in all educational institutions of a course of familiarization with the international standards concerning human rights, the extensive spread of information concerning these standards via national media, and so forth, or, in bureaucratic language, initiating active educational work. Incidentally, a model primer on human rights for elementary grades has already been written in the United Nations itself. As far as I know, the USSR State Committee for Public Education is pondering the idea of an all-union human rights lesson to be held on 10 December, the day commemorated annually as International Human Rights Day.

I believe that the task of the elimination of legal illiteracy is more than urgent for our country. The lack of a truly modern culture of human rights in Soviet society was discussed both at the First Congress of People's Deputies and at the sessions of the new USSR Supreme Soviet. Any one of us encounters this ignorance, our own included, daily—from the inability and fear of appealing unnecessarily to the court or a lawyer for the defense of one's legitimate rights and dignity, through unquestioning surrender in the face of the rudeness of a desk head in some office or a porter in a hospital to which there is "no admittance". We still must learn to apply the new law on the procedure of lodging legal appeals against the wrongful actions of the organs of state administration and officials infringing human rights.

A year ago the USSR Foreign Ministry formed the Administration for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights (UGPCh). Its function is to assist the law enforcement institutions in the elaboration of legislation conforming to international standards and the commitments of the Soviet Union and to solve humanitarian problems that arise in relations with other states, chiefly in connection with uniting families and with departure. Another important task of the administration is supporting the USSR's position and establishing mutual understanding and cooperation with other countries in the international bodies dealing with human rights—the UN General Assembly Third Committee, the Economic and Social Councils, the UN Human Rights Commission, the Subcommission for Preventing Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, the Commission for the Position of Women, the Social Development Commission, and others.

And petition-bearers have formed lines outside the administration.... Some have needed medicine for a seriously ill patient, another, a war veteran, is being refused a piece of land for a truck garden, a third has had a son convicted for murder in a drunken brawl.... In these cases, alas, the Foreign Ministry is the wrong address. It is the local and higher authorities, primarily the soviets of people's deputies, the courts, the procuracy, lawyers, public organizations, and, finally, the press which stand on guard of these rights of Soviet citizens. The desperate evidently see international authorities as their last hope. This confusion points to the inadequate knowledge of the national, domestic mechanism concerning the protection of human rights. And universal elementary legal education is essential for an understanding of this also.

Among the USSR's main commitments in the humanitarian field ensuing from the final document of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe adopted on 15 January 1989 are the citizens' assured knowledgeability concerning human rights, including people's right to know their rights and obligations and act in accordance with them, the right to access to effective means of legal protection, and a mass of other valuable rights.

The Vienna final document was published in the USSR in an edition of 11 million copies. This is laudable. The text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 6.5 million copies. Not bad also. The first large digest of documents reflecting the USSR's participation in international cooperation on human rights has just been published by the "International Relations" Publishing House. However, despite the significance of these facts, they may constitute only the start, just one part of all-embracing, all-permeating efforts to raise the legal knowledge of Soviet citizens that should be made within the framework of the world information campaign. But is there a Soviet department directly responsible for implementation of this UN resolution and for the organization of this work in general? Apparently there is not. We are still continuing to work per instructions from above. But, as far as I know, no such instructions from above have been forthcoming. Perhaps the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals will take on this job? But meanwhile it would evidently be the most prudent thing of all for educational institutions and the media to avail themselves of the tried and tested advice regarding drowning men and themselves, and at once set about the elimination of legal illiteracy: keep a close watch on how the national laws and commitments of our country that are being adopted and elaborated interlock with international human rights agreements, inform the community at large about this in a better manner, accustom people from their schooldays not only to hearing and making judgments about human rights, but also "enjoying" them correctly, and finding the most intelligible forms of explanation of this "delicate matter" for the most varied categories of Soviet citizens—workers, employees, farmers, and the youth. In this sense we have in our country a vast amount of work for the people's deputies, editorial offices, schools, and higher educational institutions, research, and law enforcement establishments—in a word, for everyone.

Not least here is cooperation with the United Nations, UNESCO, and other international organizations. The UN Center for Human Rights in Geneva is prepared to offer advisory services and jointly conduct seminars and educational courses on international standards in the field of human rights. Such institutions as the International Center for Training for Teaching Ideas of Peace and Human Rights and the World University (both also, incidentally, in Geneva) are seeking partners also.

A civilized society and a state based on the rule of law are inconceivable without firm guarantees and the actual implementation of generally recognized human rights and basic freedoms. This is now axiomatic. And it is hardly to be doubted that progress toward the genuinely humane rule of law presupposes not only the enactment of "good" laws and their fulfillment, but also the citizens' due knowledgeability concerning their rights and the laws and institutions standing on guard of these rights. This is necessary so that all can confidently answer the question "Who needs human rights?" by saying: "I and all of us."

Perm 'Political Prisoners' Called Spies

90UN0467A Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[Article by A. Alekseyev: "Masquerade—How Spies Are Made Out To Be 'Political Prisoners'"]

[Text] The criminal case of the former Leningrad physicist Mikhail Kazachkov cannot be categorized as commonplace. It has so many exciting episodes that there would be more than enough for several detective novels. The subject, briefly, is as follows.

After deciding that the salary of a junior researcher in no way meets his needs, Kazachkov undertook smuggling as a second job, and not smuggling small things but "major items." In a short time he secretly sent rare and even unique books abroad. We will not speak of academic editions of Russian classics or the "Granat" encyclopedic dictionary; their cost and the easy income received by Kazachkov were accurately calculated by the investigators down to the kopeck. But how, for example, do you fix the value of "Limonar," or "Tsvetnik Dukhovnyy," ["Spiritual Garden"] published in Kiev in 1628. A true book lover will say: This book is priceless. But Kazachkov set a price: He "peddled" it for $300.

He dealt in pictures, many of which are pearls of national art, just as ruthlessly. Just the list of names of painters will cause any cultured person to tremble: Konchalovskiy, Rerikh, Klodt... But Kazachkov, with a dauntless hand, packed their canvasses into a smuggler's hiding place in order to turn the masterpieces of art into dollars, francs, and marks, but at the same time he bought up and sent to the West silver money of antique mintage that had museum value, and he sold ancient Russian icons abroad.

Such shameless and unscrupulous operators, who get rich on anything possible, even on sacred images, have been christened "Christ betrayers" by the people. What did Kazachkov receive in exchange for the pieces of silver? Foreign contraband "dealers" sent him consumer goods intended for profiteering: hundreds of popular records, dozens of cassettes, tape recorders, and record players. If you consider, for example, that each disk was sold by a skilled dealer for three 10-ruble notes, you can imagine what kind of unjustly profitable sums he managed. For example, Kazachkov, not blinking an eye, lent one of his accomplices R25,000 after it was agreed that the rubles would be repaid in francs.

In a word, the junior research worker, as the saying goes, lived for his own pleasure, and he only realized that he was violating the Criminal Code when the militia got interested in his smuggling operations in illegal hard currency deals.

Here the subject of the detective story suddenly takes an unexpected turn. This is the way Kazachkov himself explained it during the investigation: "I wanted to go abroad as fast as possible, because I feared exposure of the smuggling activity and that criminal proceedings would be initiated. For assistance, he turned to none other than... D. Loftin, a CIA employee working "undercover" as a worker at the U.S. Consul General's office in Leningrad. It is not difficult to guess what this acquaintance turned into: A person without principles and convictions, Kazachkov was recruited as an agent of American intelligence.

"I understood that in making contact with American intelligence I was committing a crime against Soviet law," is the statement he made later during the investigation.

Kazachkov's agent work cries out for a separate novel, this time a spy novel, with all of the attributes peculiar to this genre: the collection of information of a defense nature which Kazachkov transmitted to Loftin; the compilation of a list of more than one hundred people who have access to military secrets, and which in view of this could be of interest to American intelligence; the urgent recruitment of one of the employees of a classified institute on tasking by Loftin... The epilogue of the novel is appropriate for this genre: the arrest and court trial; the sentence—15 years imprisonment, with sentence served in a corrective labor camp, so to speak, in the aggregate—for espionage, smuggling, and profiteering on a large scale.

... And here a "lyrical" chapter commences. In an appeal addressed to the Criminal Affairs Board of the Supreme Court of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the repentant criminal wrote: "It is frightening to think what might have happened to me had I not been arrested. Despite the years of punishment that face me, I am happy about what happened, because I was stopped on a path, as I now understand, that led from one crime to another."

One could stop at this point, especially since the case is an old one, and it did not raise the slightest legal doubt in anyone, including, as we see, in Kazachkov himself. But imagine, after many years he still has some defenders: The profiteer Kazachkov himself was suddenly transformed into an object of profiteering, political profiteering on an international scale. Indeed, it is hardly likely that such a thing could have been foreseen by Kazachkov even in his sleep.

In September of this year the "Voice of America" informed its listeners: "As is reported by the independent information bulletin EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA, a group of Moscow rights defenders sent an appeal to the leaders of the USSR and the United States to make every effort to free Leonid Lubman, Mikhail Kazachkov, and other prisoners from the 35th political camp at Perm.

Kazachkov, as the saying goes, "fell within range" along with his fellow inmates Lubman, Kirichenko, and Mamedov. Yesterday they were still outstanding criminals, the kind of which there are enough in any country, and today they are already figures—"political prisoners" and "victims of the regime," as if they were unjustly victimized in the years of stagnation. Various kinds of radio voices and newspapers crown them with epithets that describe them as victims. We suppose that to our readers the names of the prisoners from the Perm Camp No 35 do not mean anything. Therefore, we will fill the gaps that developed unexpectedly in glasnost and at least briefly acquaint the reader with these people who have suddenly become so famous in the West. It is likely that it will not be uninteresting to the foreign public to get acquainted with additional features in the portraits of the so-called "political prisoners" because their well-wishers prefer to remain silent about what sins really brought them behind bars.

Here is Leonid Lubman. A "Voice of America" broadcast says about him: "His guilt consists of the fact that he tried to send abroad a manuscript of his book, which contained a criticism of Romanov, a Leningrad party leader at that time." The BBC develops this theme: "He wanted to send purely political information to the West, a layout of conditions in the city of Leningrad and the oblast."

But I have Lubman's manuscript right in front of me. It was confiscated by customs at the Moscow Sheremetyevo International Airport when an attempt was made to get it out secretly by Italian citizen N. Gabrielli, an emissary of NTS [National Labor Union]. This document was by no means addressed to a wide circle of readers, but entirely to one and only one person. To whom would you think? You will never guess! Personally to the director of the CIA. But this agency, as is well-known, is not concerned so much with the "stagnant" Romanov, or with discussions on general political subjects, as with state secrets. Lubman, by the sweat of his brow, tried to show that he was a capable agent: 248 pages of his "work" contain quite a few military secrets. Its loss would cause serious damage to our country.

In a special letter addressed to the leadership of the CIA, Lubman proposed specific measures for the activation of intelligence and sabotage and subversive operations against the USSR. In particular, the organization of terror: "If an explosion occurred in the raykom [rayon party committee], and this became known to the world, then the terrorist act would be attributed to an anti-Soviet organization, and it is not important whether it exists or not. Aside from everything else, this will distract the attention of an enormous number of KGB employees..."

This is your "purely political" information...

As far as I know, similar "works" in any country, including the United States, are appraised not according to the laws of literary criticism or political discussions, but in precise conformity with articles of the criminal code. In this respect, our country is no exception: Lubman received what he deserved. To portray him as some kind of victim is at the very least not sincere, just as it is not sincere to assert that Lubman's criminal case is "fabricated by KGB organs."

David Remnick, the Moscow correspondent of THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, thought it necessary to meet with still another sham political prisoner, Sergey Kirichenko, who is now out of prison. As his article states, "Kirichenko landed in Perm Camp Number 35 in a way that is not traditional for political prisoners." For some reason the journalist again wanted to put what is clearly espionage in political clothing, in particular to justify the agent work that Kirichenko, an officer candidate of a higher service school, conducted for the benefit of the CIA.

Here are just a few of the stages of the "untraditional way": A special "secret hiding place" was set up for Kirichenko by American intelligence officers. Simultaneously, a letter was sent to him that contained a secret writing text—information with instructions on the location of the espionage container. A plan for the organization of conspiratorial contacts, and also cipher notebooks, tables with codes, and other espionage materials were found in the hiding place itself.

The last of the "magnificent foursome" lauded to the skies in the West is Vitaliy Mamedov. After going through army service in the area of the Baykonur cosmodrome, he tried to transmit information to American intelligence that was a military secret—in particular, data about classified military facilities and about a planned rocket space system. He explained in court that he had no motives for being a spy other than generous remuneration.

I do not doubt that not the slightest sympathy for these people was aroused in the unbiased reader. But we will not permit emotions to take over. We will note: These people have already been justly punished, and one can sympathize with each of them in a human way as with anyone who has been deprived of the blessing of freedom. But humane considerations cannot change the truth, and in this case it consists of the fact that we are dealing with people who transgressed both the law and moral standards. At the very least, it is absurd to declare them political prisoners. For whom and why was it necessary to put a mask of "martyrs of the regime" on the spies?

What invites attention to itself is the fact that specific official circles of certain countries are taking part in an aggressive propaganda campaign on the question of the so-called political prisoners in the USSR. Drawn into it are people from among Soviet citizens of an antisocialist bent, particularly those who group themselves around the publication of EKSPRESS KHRONIKA. The participants in the propaganda ballyhoo do not conceal their purpose. Thus, for example, a letter from F. Bartlett, a U.S. lawyer, addressed to the leadership of our country, Soviet law enforcement organs, and also to U.S. political and social figures, contains a demand for a review of Kazachkov and Lubman's criminal cases. Otherwise, the lawyer threatens (and not he alone) that pressure will be brought on the U.S. Administration so that an American delegation will not be able to participate in the International Conference on Human Rights in Moscow in 1991. Actually, attempts are being made to apply the brakes to preparations for the conference, and even to disrupt it. Apparently someone wants very much to compromise the process of democratization of Soviet society in the eyes of world opinion, to cast a shadow on the law enforcement organs of the USSR one last time, and to prohibit the further development of mutual understanding between our countries. And because of this, all stops have been pulled, including a distortion of facts and forgery. If there are no political prisoners in the Soviet Union now, they must be fabricated, of course!

The organizers of the propaganda ballyhoo failed to take one thing into account: Our society today is not at all what it was yesterday. Glasnost has become the norm of life. Thus, it is not particularly difficult to expose the spiteful critics. There are judicial sentences that are carried out by criminals. And, under the conditions of democratization of our society, even the infamous "Perm Camp Number 35" is exposed to world opinion. In July a group of foreign journalists representing French publications visited there for the first time. As a result of this trip, the Paris newspaper EKSPRESS published an extensive account of the "last Gulag," from which it obviously follows that prisoners are held there not for political convictions, but for specific criminal acts. In August the Perm camp was visited by American congressmen F. Wolf and K. Schmidt [name as published]. They were also given the opportunity to look over the territory of the zone, the housing and production facilities, and to talk face-to-face with those who were convicted for especially dangerous state crimes.

We have nothing to hide today. We have realized and talk openly about how many difficulties and problems we inherited from the stagnant past. But we need not impute that which no longer exists, and which we have departed from in the process of perestroyka. We are creating a law-governed state logically, and it is at least naive to suppose that we can be diverted from this path with a cheap sideshow. People who betrayed the country and who took the path of perfidy have been and will continue to be subject to just punishment in specific conformity to the law. And this new espionage masquerade is nothing other than a beaten card in a dirty political game that is directed against the democratization of our society.

Justice Minister Comments on Court Reform

90UN0406A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Dec 89 Morning edition p 4

[Interview with V. Yakovlev, minister of justice, by Yu. Feofanov, IZVESTIYA observer: "How the Judicial Reform is Going"]

[Text] [Feofanov] The Supreme Soviet adopted an entire package of laws that reinforce the court's independence. But the judicial and legal reform affects more than just the position of the court in the state. It also includes changes in procedural law as well. It seems to me that it is precisely this, procedural law, is most in need of improvement. Could you, Veniamin Fedorovich, tell us of further legislative programs in the area of justice. Not only what is included in the plan for legislative work but also how the scholarly developments are proceeding, in a word, what are the prospects in this area.

[Yakovlev] A reform of procedural legislation is on the agenda. I agree with you that it is procedural legislation that is significantly outdated: It does not provide for the utilization of modern scientific and technical means, on the one hand, and, on the other, it does not do a good job of protecting the rights of the citizens.

I believe that corrective labor legislation is also in need of serious reform. As far as I know, fairly intensive development of drafts is also in progress here. The direction of the work is toward humanization and increased effectiveness of the sentences and well as the effectiveness of punitive measures, social prevention, and so forth. I think that civil procedural legislation is also far from perfect. But this is apparently the next stage.

[Feofanov] But let us not get ahead of ourselves. Does the law already envision the participation of lawyers in the defense in the stage of the preliminary investigation?

[Yakovlev] In principle this problem has already been solved. In Article 14 of the recently adopted Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics concerning the judicial system it is stipulated that for someone suspected, accused, or convicted is provided with the right to a defense through the participation of the defense lawyer from the time detention, arrest, or accusation. Now this right should be regulated in detail in procedural legislation. In my opinion, to do this we should not wait for a general change in procedural legislation; rather, it should be done with a partial change of the law.

[Feofanov] But what kind of partial change? For the advocate's access, say, from the time of arrest obviously entails changing the law that regulates preliminary investigation. If, for example, the conditions for the meeting between the defendant and the lawyer are established not by law but by the investigator, then there is no point in this change. Or the notorious "investigative secrecy." Does it not tie the hands of the defense lawyer? Many lawyers are also afraid of having access to the preliminary investigation unless their immunity is guaranteed. For now at least there is no sign of competitiveness in the pretrial stages.

[Yakovlev] These and other problems arise but their solutions depend to a significant degree on the depth of the working out of the changes that will be made in procedural legislation. In connection with the defense lawyer's entry into the criminal process at an earlier stage, other, no less important problems also arise. For, as a rule, the lawyer must spend much more time on participation in the preliminary investigation than he does now on becoming familiar with the materials of the case and participating in the judicial examination of the case. Obviously, the question of increasing the body of lawyers arises. While previously the lawyer during the course of the judicial investigation participated in the examination of evidence and could submit it, now he will participate in the criminal process and during the period of gathering of evidence by the investigatory organs.

[Feofanov] Let us return to the courts. Does it not seem to you, Veniamin Fedorovich, that the most difficult problem is the material condition of the courts, particularly their buildings. For this even indicates a lack of respect for the courts but this time, alas, on the part of the state. For can one really speak about the prestige of the court when it is housed in a dilapidated building which is dirty and neglected. Unfortunately, at the Congress of People's Deputies and the session of the Supreme Soviet we did not hear a single impassioned speech about this although in general there were plenty of impassioned speeches. Now they have adopted a law on liability for a lack of respect for the court and other acts that raise the status of judges. But will this change the attitude of the people when they see the condition of the courts and how the local authorities treat them? Does it not seem to you that this deserves enthusiastic influence from the central authorities?

[Yakovlev] I agree that this problem should not leave anyone indifferent. When you are abroad and see the magnificent halls of justice—and there the judicial organs are located in the best buildings—you are automatically reminded of the stately wisdom of the authorities.

The judicial system is the holy of holies in any civilized society. This, if you will, is a question of the dignity and self-respect of the society. Naturally, the question of material expenditures and resources arises immediately. This is not a simple question under our conditions. But ultimately we are speaking about understanding the significance of the justice system and the practical realization of the idea of a law-governed state.

You mentioned the central organs. Yes, I think a statewide program should be created for solving this problem. But still, even if we have such a program, its implementation will depend to a significant degree on the attitude toward the court in the local areas. I was recently in Sverdlovsk Oblast. We discussed the fact that the only new building for a court is being constructed in one of the rayons. But then the deputies of the rayon soviet decided—why give good buildings to the courts, we should turn it into a kindergarten.

[Feofanov] The deputies should give the children, for example, the building of the rayispolkom [rayon executive committee]...

[Yakovlev] In any case, one of the administrative buildings. For, strictly speaking, the court is not an administrative institution.

[Feofanov] The "third power" in a law-governed state. Incidentally, I think we have about 4,500 judicial buildings.

[Yakovlev] Yes, that is about right. And one-third of these buildings are absolutely unsuitable for administration of justice. Just think: One-third of the courts do not have the elementary conditions for their work. And I would raise this question, for example: If somewhere in the rayon or city the leaders, people's deputies, and party and soviet leaders think that this is a problem that does not deserve attention, here is something for them to think about: Do they fully understand the changes that are taking place in our country?

[Feofanov] At the session of the Supreme Soviet they spoke more and more frequently about the fact that the courts are having to resolve increasingly complicated and socially significant conflicts. That is, the most complicated disputes between citizens and the state, the cooperative and state, and other property owners and state organs go to the courts. Complaints about actions of state organs also go to the courts. The law gives the courts certain rights. But what is the social status of the judges. I have in mind wages and a car. You will agree that the moral prestige of the judges and their authority are linked to such prosaic things as wages and all the rest. When a hooligan is judged that is one thing. But if in the current dilapidated state one is to judge a minister or a rich cooperative... Incidentally, in this case I think we would quickly find a way to put the buildings in order.

[Yakovlev] Yes, the profound economic changes that will take place in connection with the adoption of a new property law will radically change the position of the courts. A mass of property disputes will arise. It is difficult even to imagine their diversity and range. And, of course, a pile of work will fall on the courts. This will require a high level of professionalism and above all a deep understanding of the essence of economic transformations. And questions of the professional qualifications of the judges and their professional training are directly linked to the status of judges in the society. If this is an esteemed profession, if this is a respected profession, if this is a profession that is highly valued by the state, then there should be the corresponding material and other conditions. When our foreign colleagues ask about the level of payment of the judges we want to sink into the ground.

[Feofanov] And how much do the judges get?

[Yakovlev] In the rayon—at the level of 200 rubles. You understand quite well that this is ridiculous for a person who not only does a colossal amount of work but also bears the greatest amount of responsibility. But I most note that there is improvement, as Ostap Bender said, things are "getting off the ground." Quite recently the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet made a fundamental decision to increase the earnings of judges, significantly, almost doubling them. This takes into account the additional payments for the class of qualifications which will be introduced in keeping with the law on the status of judges. In a word, we hope that by 1 January 1990 the earnings for judges will be quite different.

The different property status will increase the role of the judges but also of arbitration, which considers disputes among organizations except for kolkhozes [collective farms]. Arbitration under the conditions of commodity-monetary relations should be essentially transformed and it should essentially become an economic court. We must refrain from so-called departmental arbitration, that remnant of the administrative-command system. Thus the sphere of judicial activity will be significantly expanded.

[Feofanov] I have a frank question for you Veniamin Fedorovich. Do you believe that as a result of the judicial reforms our court will acquire true independence? Why do I ask this question? Do you recall at the press conference you held I asked how justified it was to include the courts on temporary committees for fighting crime. Incidentally, this question also arose at the session; I was just repeating a deputy's doubts at that time. But that is not the problem. Now the issue has been resolved and judges are included on the temporary committees. How has this affected the activity of the courts? Are there cases of intervention in their activity? Are they succeeding in counteracting this intervention? Incidentally, your ministry is also in charge of the courts. Is there no intervention in their activity?

[Yakovlev] Let us begin with the last, the ministry. We are revising a great deal in our activity and have changed the very concept of relations to the courts. We think the Ministry of Justice should in no case be in charge of the courts because the administration of the courts is the administration of justice. But the organizational, personnel, financial, and material- technical support for the activity of the court and the creation of conditions so that the court can administer justice independent of anybody else—this is our duty. Of course the laws on the status of judges, on attempts to interfere with the dispatch of justices, disrespect for the court, and so forth must also play their role. But the laws are only "paper." And I think that one of the tasks of the Ministry of Justice is for the ideas and laws to be realized. We have a very heavy legacy. It is not easy to overcome it because stereotypes have developed; the chiefs of various levels—from the rayon level to higher ones—have become accustomed to commanding everything, including justice. The situation has changed in the higher echelons. There is no doubt that after the elections the legislative power will shift to the hands of the deputies at all levels. This inspires confidence that the judges will acquire real independence.

We have discussed court buildings and this is also an element of independence. We have discussed wages. Why do we need high wages? Because then strong jurists who cannot be commanded will come to the courts. It is possible to command professionally weak judges who are afraid of their own shadow. Unfortunately, we have quite a few such judges today. Therefore it seems to me that the new situation, the new attitude, the new wages, the new material conditions, and the new laws will gradually form the climate under whose conditions only real, independent justice is possible. It will be formed; I am convinced of this. But this will take time and colossal efforts, and sanctions: prosecution and liability for disrespect for the court. But the issue is very complicated and therefore we must be prepared to fight for the future of justice.

About the temporary committees for fighting crime. I know that there is the danger that they will take command of justice and will go beyond the framework of of mere coordination of the efforts of social and state organs in fighting crime. Incidentally, at the meeting of the union committee that considered model provisions and they were approved by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet as a recommendatory document for the republics. In the provisions, incidentally, in point 3 it says: "The committees operate on the basis of the strictest observance of the requirements of the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, the laws of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, and they may not interfere in the operational-investigatory and procedural activity of the organs of the militia, investigation, procurator's office, and courts in specific cases of crimes that are being contemplated or have been committed." Moreover this question was discussed: May the committee consider information—I am not saying reports, but precisely information from procurator and court organs? It was decided that even information from the courts must be excluded because, as someone noted, "in the wrong hands" this can be used as a means of exerting pressure on the court.

[Feofanov] Have there been any attempts to apply pressure on the court in the local areas?

[Yakovlev] Yes. But not from the temporary committees. Rather the reverse. As an example I can give the appeal of the Karelian ASSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Justice. The former was dissatisfied with the practice of one of the people's courts: It assigns penalties which, in the opinion of the internal affairs minister, do not provide for a proper fight against crime. He referred to specific cases and analyzed and criticized specific sentences and told the minister of justice that this position does not meet the requirements of the party and government for stepping up the fight against crime. The temporary committee of the Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] indicated to the internal affairs minister that his very appeal contradicts the principle of independence of the courts, that this was an attempt at interference in justice, and that the minister of justice could not give the courts any instructions: There are legal ways of protesting and overturning sentences if they are not fair. I emphasize that they are judicial and not administrative.

[Feofanov] The Supreme Soviet ruled in favor of the court with a jury. This is a principally different form of legal procedures. Even if a small number of cases be decided by juries this will entail different forms of appeals. What about judicial supervision? We have prerevolutionary experience and foreign countries have experience. What changes, Veniamin Fedorovich, in the entire judicial system will bring about the introduction of the new formation into the courts?

[Yakovlev] It is written in Article 11 of the Basic Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics on Legal Proceedings as a basic point that in a court of the first instance cases are heard collegially, by judges and people's assessors. Another variant is also envisioned: For cases of crimes for which the law envisions the death sentence or imprisonment for more than 10 years, the question of the guilt of the accused may be decided by a jury (expanded collegium of people's assessors) according to the procedure established by the legislation of the union republics.

This is a new norm for us and it opens up the path to a new form of judicial proceedings, and it also offers the union republics an alternative: That is, they can decide.

There was a jury system in prerevolutionary Russia for more than 50 years, and certain countries have one even now. This experience, of course, can be used, but there can be no question of a mechanical transfer of experience from any one country. Moreover, questions of juries are decided in different ways in different countries.

A couple of examples. In England—where the jury system originated—all upstanding citizens from 21 to 60 years of age may be jurors. Drawing up the lists is the responsibility of the local authorities. The appropriate number of jurors is called for each court session in the order in which their names appear on the list.

In Russia the general lists of jurors were compiled by the leaders of the local authorities with 60 jurors and 6 alternates for each judge. The lists were submitted to the chairman of the district court. The jurors were selected for each case according to a complicated procedure: A group of 24 people was chosen which included both jurors and some alternates. The procurator or the private plaintiff, on the one hand, and the accused and his defender, on the other, each had the right to cross off three names from the list. The final formation of the office (bench) of jurors was done by drawing lots: 12 jurors and 2 alternates were selected from the names remaining on the list.

In Russia the jurors had to answer questions about the crime, the guilt of the accused, and his responsibility. In England the jurors had to answer only one question: whether or not they agreed with the complaint against the accused. In England for a long time the jury decision had to be unanimous but in recent years a decision can be made by 10 out of 12 votes or 9 out of 10. In Russia the jurors made a decision by a majority of votes and if the votes were even they ruled in favor of the accused.

Legislators and scholars of the union republics who decide to use juries will have to do a large amount of work for creating the procedural laws related to them, including solving problems of appeals and judicial supervision. I think that this form of legal procedure will enrich our judicial system and contribute to raising the level of justice.

Procuracy Says MVD Violates Juvenile Crime Laws

90UN0310A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 46, 18-24 Nov p 3

[Unattributed article: "Tyranny or Law"]

[Text] Analysis of documents available at the USSR Procuracy revealed widespread, substantial violations by internal affairs organs [MVD] of legislation on the legal responsibility of minors and distortions of precautionary work with juveniles.

The number of minors handed over to the militia organs has approached one million a year, the majority of them juveniles who have not reached the age of legal responsibility (57 percent). Of those handed over to the militia in 1988, 28 percent were younger than 14.

A spot check of more than 15,000 documents on young "lawbreakers" showed that more than one third of them were arrested and turned over to the militia illegally.

The grounds for many of the arrests are clearly absurd or unbelievable: "loitering", "writing graffiti", "collecting candy wrappers from trash cans for the game of fantiki", and "carrying a stuffed animal toy".

Arrests on the so-called grounds of "for verification" and "to establish identity" are especially widespread (up to 35 percent). The study also disclosed incidents of illegal use of handcuffs and fingerprinting.

In the city of Kemerovo, for example, tyranny has generally become the norm. It is known that children are detained in holding cells for 9-20 hours without any kind of judicial processing. OVD workers in the Rudnichnyy Rayon have conducted night interrogations of more than 50 administrative detainees.

There is a reverse process occurring simultaneously. The number of juveniles handed over to the juvenile authorities is decreasing. In 1988, 41 percent of them went directly to militia holding cells where they were kept in conditions which were antagonistic and, at times, outrageous to human dignity.

In the city of Khabarovsk, the patrol and point duty service, duty officers, and other people on 24-hour detail developed their own form of "warrant" for the arrest of juveniles, based on the work "norms" used by every other branch of the militia.

In Tashkent Oblast, the number of minors handed over by each inspector in the juvenile authorities department is evaluated as a performance indicator. The evaluation starts "from the previous high".

Many of these distortions of the militia's work practices with juveniles are suffered by runaways. In 90 percent of the cases, one of the reasons for these occurrences is the demoralization of the family, drunkenness, parental narcotic addiction or prostitution, or brutal treatment of the children. Instead of punishing the parents, however, it is essentially the children who are punished, though their home life is unfortunate enough as it is.

At the USSR Procuracy Board, the head of the USSR MVD prevention directorate, B.V. Voronov, acknowledged that the deteriorating work with children is faulty and criticism is justified.

The board adopted measures to strengthen procuracy oversight of the legality of administrative practices and to punish the people guilty of the violations uncovered.

MVD Internal Troops Political Chief Interviewed

PM2111120589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 First Edition p 6

["Topical Interview" with Major General Ye. Nechayev, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops Political Directorate, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel R. Markushin: "Defending People"; date, place not given]

[Text] Correspondent: Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, when talking about the internal troops the mass media often write about servicemen's courage and the difficulties involved in their service, and do not overlook questions linked with their physical training, equipment, and so on. But the way in which internal troops are prepared politically and morally is discussed somewhat infrequently. Yet service in the troops requires, in my view, some special training because they sometimes find themselves in serious situations.

Ye. Nechayev: Such questions have been put to us. Sometimes, so to speak, in an incorrect form. I recall the following question was asked at one press conference: "Tell us, how do you educate your assassins?" But let this wording remain on the journalist's conscience and let me say the following about education: We have no more important task today than the patriotic and international education of our personnel. Let us begin by saying that representatives of virtually all the country's nations and ethnic groups, without exception, serve within our troops. For instance, people of 10-15 nationalities on average serve in one company. They perform their service—once again without exception—on the territory of all union and autonomous republics and other national-territorial formations. Thus the question of international education is not only connected with the well-known events in Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, and other republics, although these events prompt us to step up this work, for we are living on the same planet and the processes that are now taking place in Armenia and Azerbaijan, for instance, cannot fail to make an impact on the life of our troop collectives. Do not forget that the personnel of our troops deal with weapons every day. Now take a banal and at the same time very complex situation: We send an Armenian and an Azerbaijani to guard a facility. In this case we must be convinced if not of their friendly, at least of their loyal attitude to one another: For everyone has a combat submachinegun with the corresponding basic ammunition... I must say that we have not as yet had a single serious conflict on ethnic grounds, or, what is more, one with grave consequences. This, I believe, is the main indicator in our educational work and the activity of the party-political apparatus.

Correspondent: You talked about party-political work. What new elements have now emerged in it? One must not work using old methods in a changing situation.

Ye. Nechayev: That's right. Nevertheless, I repeat, we have always worked to provide troop personnel with an international education; we are not starting from scratch during these alarming days. It is another matter that, having come into direct contact with extreme forms of these wide-ranging manifestations of interethnic dissension, which we have been directly involved in suppressing or, so to speak, regularizing, and finding ourselves at the very center of the turbulent cauldron of interethnic passions, we have realized that our old experience in many respects "does not work" and that something quite different is required. We have had to reappraise existing experience and derive from it those elements that are of use under current conditions and—and this is the main thing—elaborate new elements, proceeding from existing reality.

Correspondent: What has been done in this respect?

Ye. Nechayev: I will not of course describe everything; I will be brief. We have reviewed the subject matter for political classes and changed the teaching methods. Propaganda measures have changed; debate, exchanges of opinions, and lively discussions aimed at elucidating the essence of the phenomena taking place in the country have become part of our lives. We are gradually abandoning regimentation in the work of party and All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League organizations, and the role of the army community is increasing. I repeat, this is a brief summary. All our work takes place directly at the local level where soldiers are serving. That is the main thing. I can say on the whole that the last few years have been some of the most difficult in the history of the internal troops' political bodies—they recently celebrated their 70th anniversary—since their task is not merely to raise good soldiers, NCO's, warrant officers, and officers, but political fighters as well.

Correspondent: The office of political fighter, agitator is a hard one. How do you train an 18-19-year-old lad, the schoolchild of yesteryear, a student from a vocational and technical college, a grain grower with, to put it bluntly, scant experience to prepare him for this work? You must have very firm and deep convictions to convince someone else, because any insincerity or uncertainty will be noticeable straightaway, and that kind of "agitation" will not only fail to produce positive results, but may cause the reverse effect.

Ye. Nechayev: That's the point. We are faced with a double task. On the one hand, we must raise people who are fully convinced of the correctness of their work as a noble international mission and who feel themselves to be the representatives of a multiethnic troop collective coming to the aid of their brothers to prevent bloodshed; on the other hand, we must train people who are able to impart this conviction to those who have been blinded by extremists and dissuade them. Nightsticks, "cheremukha" gas, and submachineguns are not the main argument here. Words are the principal argument. I will be honest with you and say that we have had to busy ourselves here, especially since the situation does not leave time for special reflection.

Correspondent: Well, what about results?

Ye. Nechayev: The main one is one that hitherto none of our officers, warrant officers, NCO's, or soldiers have succumbed to the provocations or lost their reason.

Correspondent: Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, could you not just briefly enumerate the areas of your work that enable internal troops to appear as you have described them.

Ye. Nechayev: Of course. First, let me say a few words about the image of the soldier in the internal troops that is foisted on the population by extremists. This is the image of a stranger who has come to suppress manifestations of national consciousness, democracy, and so on. What conjectures are circulated! There are only Russians there (in the internal troops) who have been angered by the fact that we are holding up our heads. It is said that the soldiers with blue shoulder straps are former inmates of children's homes with no parents, and that is why they are such ruthless people. It was said that the internal troops came to various regions straight from Chernobyl, where people received a large dose of radiation, and it was alleged that they had 2 weeks to live and bore malice.

In that situation it is hard to overestimate the significance of correct information for people intoxicated by nationalist fervor. We were simply obliged to show that we all—the children of different peoples—came to the region to defend people from bandit elements and put a stop to the exhausting strife in order to protect man's chief right, the right to life. But, in order to achieve this, we had, so to speak, to go to the people. That is what we did. We organized regular meetings for servicemen with labor collectives, students, schoolchildren, and citizens in their place of residence. We created agitation groups made up of the best trained people at subunits. For instance, we held 700 meetings with working people in Fergana in 2 months—and the situation was most complex. There was everything here—both polemics and raised voices—but at any rate, ultimately calm, well-considered, unhurried words prevailed.

We are often faced with the problem of the language barrier. How can it be overcome? We began by publishing and circulating very simple phrase books. We published them in our newspaper NA STRAZHE, which is published in the Transcaucasus region and circulated among the personnel of the units operating there. We were able to prepare and circulate pamphlets. I assure you that these phrase books do not begin with the phrase "Halt! or I'll fire," but with the words "hello," "please," thank you very much," and "excuse me." Where possible, we organized classes to master very simple phrases and study the customs, ways, and traditions of the people on whose territory the subunits found themselves. And we always stressed in everything the need for everyone to respect the people's traditions, the need for irreproachable behavior, benevolence, and an endeavor to understand people.

This has borne fruit. In many cases people have ceased to regard us as enemies, not to mention the fact that people can assess the soldier's responsiveness, selflessness, and readiness to assist. The news has traveled throughout virtually all Abkhazia that internal troop students shed blood to save a mother and child. I will never forget our troops' trip to Kokand, to a children's sanatorium where children are treated for tuberculosis. How the sick children's eyes shone when they saw the soldiers—cheerful, sincere, reliable—who came to them with a concert and with simple gifts bought from their small (only R7!) pay. What sort of lesson is this for the adults? They realized that these lads who are now playing with their children will don bulletproof vests and helmets in the evening and fulfill their duty, at risk to their lives.

Correspondent: Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, do you think that the situation in the "hotspots" is now tending to improve?

Ye. Nechayev: You know, it is said that it is hard to be optimistic now. But we must be optimistic. We have simply no other way out. But being optimistic means working for perestroyka; for us it means serving in a fitting manner, doing everything in your power, whatever the cost. I consider mutual understanding to be possible. Our main argument on the way to achieving it is, I repeat, speech.

Legal Rights of Criminal Suspects Discussed

*90UN0377A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3*

[Article by Yu. Feofanov: "Limits on Power"]

[Text] Just look at the issues being discussed by our parliament—leasing relationships, juries, the 1939 treaty, pensions... And everything is compressed to the limit in time. But, I ask myself, is there some kind of system in all this law-drafting chaos?

Practically all laws pass one way or another through a parliamentary committee on matters of legislation, legality, and law and order. Thus, we can trace such a system if we familiarize ourselves with the committee's activity. It is just my personal opinion, but I would say that our young democratic legislator is giving back to the people that which was taken from them by the command authority over the course of seven decades. This is especially evident if one traces this course in the laws regarding justice and the guarantee of citizens' rights and freedoms.

The Congress of People's Deputies set the tone for this, if you recall, rising up against Article 11, now already sunk into administrative oblivion. This norm subjected each of us to the arbitrariness of administrative authority: A careless utterance, witticism, or anecdote could get you in prison. And what is it like now? Nothing other than the prosecutor's approval is required today to detain, arrest, or put someone in isolation. All one can do is write the United Nations from his pre-trial isolation cell: Prior to sentencing the accused was absolutely deprived of rights.

Journalists and legal scholars have written a great deal about how such a situation contradicts all the laws of God and man, but the institutions have towered unshakably over elementary justice. Honestly I hoped, but did not really believe, that our democracy would be able to attempt to scale this cliff. Nonetheless, this did happen.

On 22 November the committee on legislation discussed the matter of admitting legal counsel to the preliminary investigation. This was decided in principle a long time ago, a year ago in fact. But how this will look in practical terms is more important than the principle itself.

At what point in time, for example, can a suspect arrested by the police engage the services of a lawyer? From the very instant of arrest, one opinion advocates. There is some uncertainty: "This is realistic in Estonia, where you have enough lawyers; but in Yakutiya?" But then there is other doubt—if we cite "circumstances," "difficulties," and "reality," won't all of this smudge the democratic norm itself? Committee members are reaching the consensus, or understanding as they used to say in Russia, that a suspect should have the legal assistance of a lawyer 24 hours after his arrest.

"But will the lawyer be able to discuss matters with his client in private, without the investigator?" asks a committee member.

Another problem. Some hold the view that if the investigator is denied the opportunity of "establishing contact with the suspect" one-on-one, without a lawyer, this will hamper the struggle against crime. The services of a legal defender should be allowed when the charge is presented. Agreement was reached. During the above-mentioned 24 hours the investigator has the right to "establish contacts" with the suspect one-on-one, and then the individual is guaranteed the right of defense to the full extent, according to civilized legal norms.

I am afraid some readers will consider these arguments on procedural nuances to be trifling. I am even more afraid of the somewhat persistent view that it is hardly worth being concerned about rights for thieves, rapists, and murderers. If you get hold of all the recent legal publications, you see that they fall into two categories that might seem to support opposing positions: We must fight relentlessly against crime; we must guarantee the rights of our citizens, even those suspected of the above-mentioned crimes. But on reflection we see that these positions are not mutually exclusive. They contain certain inherent contradictions, but these must be resolved in the law, for the citizen finds himself between a rock and a hard place, between the efforts of two arbitrary forces: the criminals and the authorities. There is no choice here: We need a legal compromise.

The inviolability of the individual is the alpha and omega of the law in this regard. This was regarded as of paramount importance during the discussion of yet another urgent issue—arresting authority. Currently this is practically the unchecked prerogative of the prosecutor.

It was said during the discussion that this contradicted general principles of the democratic process: you know, the tragic role that can be played by arrest when there is insufficient evidence.

Yes, we know all too well—from our ancient as well as most recent history. The opinion was also voiced, therefore, that authority for arrest may legally be given only by a court, acting according to democratic procedure.

This did not meet with unconditional support.

—If approval for arrest is given by the same court that then examines the matter, this court will already have acquired for itself an "accusatory disposition."

—The problem is not in the prospect of the prosecutor making groundless arrests, but in the fact that he has begun to fear choosing this as a confinement measure, even when it is necessary. Half the malicious hooligans in Moscow and Leningrad are allowed to roam the streets following their arrest prior to trial.

—The criminal process is in need of democratization, this is clear. But has sufficient attention been given to another problem? With approximately 220,000 arrests sanctioned each year, will the courts be able to handle the load?

—We must toughen our approaches to fighting crime but guarantee the rights of citizens at the same time. The toughening aspect is easier and less expensive. The guaranteeing of rights is always difficult and expensive. But if we wish to build a law-governed state, we must pay the price. If we are going to calculate the cost of guaranteeing the inviolability of the individual and citizens' freedoms, we might as well forget about this.

Committee Chairman S.S. Alekseyev tried to reconcile the sides. The idea of court approval agrees with the age-old principles of a law-governed state and international agreements we have acknowledged. But we cannot ignore the objections of the other side.

The committee has not yet reached a unified decision. But the very idea of court sanction for arrests or the right of appeal to the court of a prosecutor's sanction has already ceased to be just an abstract subject of social and political journalism. It has not yet acquired the status of a legal norm, has not even been drawn up in the appropriate format for presentation to the legislator. But it is hardly likely now that the concept can be covered up.

All of us are still not very accustomed to limitation of the state's prerogatives in favor of its citizens. In practical terms, power of administration over us has been unrestricted over our entire history—harder during certain periods, softer during others, but never limited by law. Laws adopted were those which were advantageous and convenient for the administrative-bureaucratic system in the Stalin or Brezhnev versions. In my view, limits on power are being established by the legislator for the first time, albeit with friction and at some cost. I would like to hope that the movement is irreversible.

Supreme Court Plenum on Organized Crime

90UN0410A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "In the USSR Supreme Court"]

[Text] A regular plenum of the USSR Supreme Court was held with E.A. Smolentsev in the chair.

One of the current issues of combating organized crime was considered on the basis of a report by Chairman of the Court Collegium for Criminal Cases S.B. Romazin.

Recently, the issue of the responsibility of individuals committing various criminal acts in conjunction with transacting the sale and purchase of cars has become particularly acute. Such acts are frequently committed by organized groups, which considerably increases the social danger they pose.

In keeping with the procedures established by the USSR Council of Ministers with a view to combating speculation, the sale of cars owned by citizens may be accomplished only through used car dealerships and at prices which do not exceed state retail prices. Frequently, the sellers get considerable sums from the buyers on top of the used car's valuation. The plenum clarified that the actions of purchasers which are expressed in the unlawful confiscation of the above sums from the buyers should be classified, depending on the method of confiscation, as theft, robbery, banditry, extortion, or fraud.

If, in the course of finalizing a transaction, the buyer promises to pay the seller an additional sum while deliberately not intending to keep his promise and cheats the seller by imitating the transfer of money (by handing over the so-called "doll," a forged passbook "for the bearer," the key to a locker in a check-room in which the money is supposedly kept, etc.) the actions of the buyer should be classified as fraud.

Similar actions by purchasers in the course of finalizing purchases and sales of other types of assets (houses, second homes, etc.) are to be classified similarly.

In view of the unlawful nature of the transactions, the sellers of the cars may be obligated to turn over to the state what has been unjustifiably received.

Based on the report of Deputy Chairman of the USSR Supreme Court A.M. Filatov, the plenum considered an issue which has arisen in the practice of the courts—the responsibility of habitual alcoholics and drug addicts referred for mandatory treatment to the treatment and labor-therapy prevention facilities for evading treatment and correctional labor measures.

In its clarification, the court explained that abandoning the facility itself or a guarded work site at any facility without authorization, as well as escaping on the way to the treatment facility, entail penalties provided by the law, including criminal penalties (Article 186 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Criminal Code and corresponding articles of the criminal codes of other union republics). On the other hand, abandoning the facility without authorization and the failure to return to the treatment facility from production facilities which are not guarded, or the failure to return to the treatment facility from leave or short-term release before the deadline set may only entail disciplinary penalties for violating the established regimen for staying in the treatment facility.

The plenum also considered the appeals of court cases by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and the USSR general prosecutor, including the cases of more than 200 persons subjected to repressions in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's. All of them were recognized to be innocent and completely rehabilitated.

In its rulings on cases resolved in recent years, the plenum urged the courts to unconditionally comply with the legislation in effect, particularly to severely punish individuals guilty of committing serious crimes and repeat offenders, and to apply penalties not associated with the deprivation of freedom with regard to persons who have committed for the first time crimes which do not pose a considerable social danger and who are capable of being reformed without being isolated from society.

USSR General Prosecutor A.Ya. Sukharev and USSR Deputy Minister of Justice V.T. Gubarev took part in the proceedings of the plenum.